00031951

BOMBAY BRANCH
OF THE
ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY
TOWN HALL, BOMBAY.

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 02 July, 2018

THE ENGLISH AND THEIR ORIGIN.

LONDON
PRINTED BY SPOTTISWOODE AND CO.
NEW-STREET SQUARE

THE ENGLISH AND THEIR ORIGIN.

A PROLOGUE

TO

AUTHENTIC ENGLISH HISTORY.

216

31951

ae

BY

LUKE OWEN PIKE, M.A.

OF LINCOLN'S INN, BARRISTER-AT-LAW.

LIBRARY OF THE BOMBAY BRANCH OF THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY

Ἡ γλῶσσ' ὀμώμοχ' ἡ δὲ φρὴν ἀνώμοτος. — EURIPIDES.

uu b 31

LONDON:

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.

1866.

The right of translation is reserved.

PREFACE.

EVERY MAN who writes a book should, I think, have at least two good reasons for writing it. In the first place, he should be able to assert without fear of contradiction that what he has done is in itself worth doing; in the second place, he ought to have good grounds for believing that it has not been done before.

I suppose no one will deny that, if any literary task is worth undertaking, an Englishman may consider all time well spent which is spent in attempting to ascertain what are the bodily and mental features possessed by the majority of Englishmen, to what sources those features are to be traced, and how far they resemble or differ from the marked features of other nations. I have then at least one excuse for my book.

It is dangerous to assert that there is anything new under the sun; I can only say that, so far as I am aware, no one has hitherto entered upon a systematic investigation of the whole subject. I have met with some historical criticism, with some philological

arguments, and with some evidence bearing upon the physical characteristics of the English and their ancestors. But I have met with no examination of the Englishman's general disposition; with no sketch of the Englishman in action drawn according to any fixed principles of art or science. I have met with no independent attempt to sift and knead together the whole of the evidence which has reference to our origin. The historian has generally taken for granted whatever the philologist, or the observer of physical characteristics, has chosen to tell him; and each of these latter has in turn been no less ready to take for granted whatever he has found to his taste in the writings of the other or of the historian. I have endeavoured to analyse the whole of the evidence for myself, and have touched, though but lightly, upon one branch which I believe to be almost entirely new.

But although I think I have some justification for publishing my book, I publish it with no slight diffidence. We see every day that those who sail upon little-known and dangerous seas make shipwreck more frequently than they discover new lands. And I very much fear that some of those readers who may merely glance at what I consider the least important of these pages, without considering the context, will suspect that my vessel has gone to pieces

on the loadstone island of Celtic philology, whence few, if any, have returned in safety.

It is therefore perhaps advisable for me to state here that I am not trying to prove Englishmen to be Welshmen.

I know very well what ridiculous attempts have been made to prove all kinds of ethnological absurdities from some supposed connexion between the Celtic and certain other languages by writers who apparently knew little of the languages compared, and nothing of the principles of Comparative Philology. I look upon it therefore as a misfortune that I have been compelled to go into the philological question. But it seems to me that my essay would not be complete without some attempt to ascertain the affinities of the pre-Roman inhabitants of this island. I do not believe that those affinities can be ascertained by the inspection of languages alone; I do not believe the evidence of language, however strong, to be of any ethnological value unless supported by wholly independent testimony. But I think philology may sometimes give a useful hint; and, as will be seen in the second and following chapters, I have availed myself of her suggestions, and have afterwards submitted them to what I believe to be the best possible tests.

I think resemblances of language always furnish a

case for enquiry, but no more. We may fairly ask why negroes in Hayti speak French, and why Frenchmen speak a modification of Latin. We may also fairly ask why some of the languages commonly called Aryan differ from one another according to certain general rules; why two or more languages agree with one another in certain sounds, and yet differ from the rest of the Aryan family. Why do the Roman and the Gael use the sound *k* where the German uses the sound *f*, and where the Greek and the Welshman agree in using the sound *p*? Why do the Roman, the German, and the Gael agree in using the sound *s* where the Welshman and the Greek agree in using the sound *h*?

It would, I think, be less absurd to found an ethnological argument on these definite philological rules than to assume that every linguistic connexion, however remote, implies blood-relationship. Yet this assumption is made by almost every philologist who touches upon ethnology, no less by those who declare most European nations to be of the 'Aryan stock' than by those who lose themselves in a search for the lost tribes of Israel.

But it has been my aim to avoid all assumptions, and to draw all my conclusions from evidence. I should be inconsistent with myself were I to assume that any philological laws are identical with any

ethnological laws. But, precisely as I enquire what, if any, is the ethnological significance of the fact that the English speak a language of which the grammar is to a great extent Teutonic, I enquire what, if any, is the ethnological significance of certain other philological facts and rules pointed out in the second chapter. The importance of these facts is in each case determined by independent evidence.

I may be permitted further to point out that, if the whole of the philological discussion were omitted from this essay, I should still have a mass of evidence hardly the less powerful in favour of my conclusions; and, yet further, should all the evidence be rejected by which I have attempted to arrive at a positive and definite result, there would still be enough to demonstrate that we Englishmen are not what we are commonly supposed to be.

In my anxiety to escape from a particular danger I have said more on this subject than I ought perhaps to have said in a preface; especially as I have made similar remarks elsewhere. I shall endeavour to atone for this offence by saying here as little as possible on the other branches of the enquiry, the treatment of which must speak for itself.

In dealing with the higher mental characteristics of the different peoples compared, and in attempting to classify them, I have been met by this very great

difficulty: it is nearly, if not quite, impossible for any one to make himself a competent judge of all intellectual manifestations; and I fear that anyone may be accused of presumption who enters upon the task which I have undertaken. I can only say that I am quite sensible of my own deficiencies; that I have done my best to draw a sketch which, though incomplete, I believe to be correct as far as it goes; and that in the fine arts I have trusted authors of different schools who agree on those points to which my attention has been directed, and have carefully avoided giving any criticisms of my own.

I have to express my obligations to Dr. Beddoe, of Clifton, who has most kindly allowed me to quote two unpublished papers which were of considerable service to me in the investigation of physical characteristics; to Dr. Barnard Davis, who took the trouble to send me the measurements of some skulls in his collection; to Mr. Newton, and to Mr. Vaux, of the British Museum, who, in their respective departments, gave me every possible information, and who made some very valuable suggestions; to Professor Longmore, and to Dr. de Chaumont, of the Army Medical School at Netley, whose assistance enabled me to measure some skulls in the Medical Staff Museum in the least possible time; and to Mr. C. Carter Blake, from

whom I have more than once obtained some very useful anatomical information.

I believe I have in all cases acknowledged my obligations to workers in the same field with myself; but in order that I may escape the charge of even an unintentional plagiarism, I append a list of works consulted. Some of these have been studied for years; others have only been looked into in search of evidence bearing upon particular points. But my essay itself can best tell what use I have made of my predecessors.

I am responsible for the translations of quoted passages except in those instances in which the translator's name is mentioned.

I have for two reasons retained the old-fashioned spelling of some names found in classical authors and elsewhere. In the first place (to give an instance) the general reader is, even now, more accustomed to Celt than to Kelt, and likes it better; in the second place, I think he has good grounds for his liking. There are only two excuses for writing Kelt: one of which is that the Greek form of the word is in that way preserved, the other that Kelt suggests the true pronunciation. But I cannot see why we need discard an old custom in order to adopt the Greek spelling of a word for which we are indebted at least as much to Latin as to Greek authors. And if

pronunciation is to be our guide, there is an end of all our old orthography. It is as easy to give a hard sound to the first letter of the word Celt as to give the sound *off* to the letters *ough* in the word cough.

A phonetic system of spelling may be desirable; but be that as it may, I doubt whether such a system is possible. By what system of spelling, for instance, could an Englishman unacquainted with any language but his own be taught to pronounce the German word *ich*, or the French word *rue*? And if he cannot be taught the true pronunciation of a French or German word, what guarantee have we that he can be taught the true pronunciation of a word which appears as a foreign name in ancient Greek or Latin authors?

To discard an old and adopt a new system of spelling on pretence of securing accurate pronunciation, is simply to mislead. No one who reads English history supposes *Lewis* to be an accurate representation of the French Louis, or would care to see it printed *Looee*. Nor does anyone suppose that an Englishman pronounces the words Cincius and Cicero exactly as a Roman pronounced them. But if we are not to translate French vowels into English vowels, why need we pretend to give a faithful rendering of Latin or of Greek consonants? And if we are to affect accuracy in the consonants, why not in the vowels

also? Why should we not turn *e* into *a*, *i* into *e*, *a* and *u* into—who can say what? No one is likely to pronounce either French or even modern Greek as those languages ought to be pronounced except by the aid of a special training, the want of which can never be supplied by a system of spelling. The English are avowedly inconsistent in their orthography, but it is better to be avowedly inconsistent than to set up an unjustifiable claim to consistency.

LONDON: *May* 1866.

LIST OF WORKS CONSULTED.

Ancient Laws and Institutes of England, printed under direction of the Commissioners on the Public Records, London, folio, 1840

Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, *see* Monumenta Historica Britannica

Annuaire du Bureau des Longitudes, Paris, 12mo. 1837

ASSER, *see* Monumenta Historica Britannica

BAIN (Alexander) The Senses and the Intellect (2nd edition), London, 8vo., 1864

BAIN (Alexander) The Emotions and the Will, London, 8vo., 1859

BAIN (Alexander) On the Study of Character, London, 8vo., 1861

BEDA, *see* Monumenta Historica Britannica

BEDDOE (J.) On the Supposed Increasing Prevalence of Dark Hair in England. Anthropological Review, vol. i. London, 8vo., 1863

BEDDOE (J.) On the Head-forms of the West of England. Not yet published

BEDDOE (J.) On the Testimony of Local Phenomena in the West of England to the Permanence of Anthropological Types. Not yet published

BENDSEN (Bende) Die Nordfriesische Sprache, Leiden, 8vo., 1860

BLUMENBACH (Johann Friedrich) VI Decades et Nova Pentas Craniorum, Göttingen, 4to., 1828

BOSWORTH (Jos.) Dictionary of the Anglo-Saxon Language, London, 8vo., 1838

BOSWORTH (Jos.) The Origin of the English, Germanic, and Scandinavian Languages and Nations, London, 8vo., 1848

Boxiana, The Illustrated, London, 8vo., 1865

BROCA (Paul) Recherches sur l'Hybridité Animale en général et sur l'Hybridité Humaine en particulier, Paris, 8vo., 1860

BROCA (Paul) Recherches sur l'Ethnologie de la France, mémoire lu à la Société d'Anthropologie de Paris le 21 juillet 1859

Buckle (Henry Thomas) History of Civilisation in England (3rd edition), London, 8vo., 1861

Cæsar, Ed. Lemaire, Paris, 8vo. 1819

Census (The) of Great Britain in 1841; Population Enumeration Abstract published in 1843, London, 4to.

Census (The) of Great Britain in 1851, published by authority of the Registrar-General, London, 8vo., 1854

Combe (George) The Constitution of Man (4th edition), Edinburgh, 8vo., 1836

Darwin (Charles) On the Origin of Species by means of Natural Selection, London, 12mo., 1861

Davies (Edward) Celtic Researches, London, 8vo., 1804

Davies (Rev. Jno.) *see* Philological Transactions

Davis (Dr. Barnard) and Thurnam (Dr.) Crania Britannica, London, 4to. and folio, 1856, &c.

De Staël (Madame) De l'Allemagne, Paris, 8vo., 1844

Dictionnaire des Sciences Médicales, par une Société de Médecins et de Chirurgiens; vol. liv., article 'Tempéramens,' Paris, 8vo., 1821

Diodorus Siculus, Ed. C. Müller, Paris, 8vo., 1842

Dio Cassius, Ed. Bekker, Leipzig, 8vo., 1849

Donaldson (John William) On English Ethnography, published in the 'Cambridge Essays,' 1856, Cambridge and London, 8vo.

Donaldson (John William) New Cratylus (2nd edition), London, 8vo., 1850

Donaldson (John William) Varronianus, London, 8vo., 1852

Edwards (W. F.) Des Caractères Physiologiques des Races Humaines, Paris, 8vo., 1829

Encyclopædia Britannica (8th edition), Edinburgh, 4to., 1853, &c. The Preliminary Dissertations, the articles 'Anatomy,' 'Architecture,' 'Drama,' 'Druids,' 'Gas-light,' 'Poetry,' 'Printing,' 'Sanitary Science,' and others

Esquiros (Alphonse) L'Angleterre et la Vie Anglaise, Paris, 8vo., 1859

Esquiros (Alphonse) La Néerlande et la Vie Hollandaise, Paris, 12mo., 1859

Fergusson (James) History of the Modern Styles of Architecture, London, 8vo., 1862

Fistiana, or the Oracles of the Ring, London, 8vo., 1865

Garnett (Richard) The Philological Essays of, London and Leipzig, 8vo., 1859

Gildas, *see* Monumenta Historica Britannica

Hardy (Thomas Duffus) Descriptive Catalogue of Materials re-

lating to the History of Great Britain and Ireland, published by the authority of the Lords Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury, under the direction of the Master of the Rolls, London, 8vo., 1862-5.

HAYM (R.) Hegel und seine Zeit, Berlin, 8vo., 1857

HERODOTUS, Ed. Gaisford, Oxon, 8vo., 1824

HOMER, Iliad and Odyssey, Ed. Ernesti, Leipzig, 8vo. 1824

HUME (David) History of England, London, 8vo., 1854

HUXLEY (T. H.) *see* Laing.

HUXLEY (T. H.) The Elements of Comparative Anatomy, London, 8vo., 1864

IOLO MSS. published by Welsh MSS. Society, London and Abergavenny, 8vo., 1848

ISIDORE (Archbishop of Seville) Works, Rome, 4to., 1797

JORNANDES, *see* Monumenta Historica Britannica

KEMBLE (John Mitchell) The Saxons in England, London, 8vo., 1849

KINGSLEY (Charles) The Roman and the Teuton, London, 8vo., 1864

KNOX (Dr. Robt.) The Races of Men, London, 8vo., 1862

KOHL (Johann Georg) Die Marschen und Inseln der Herzogthümer Schleswig und Holstein, Dresden, 12mo., 1846

LAING (S.) and HUXLEY (T. H.) Pre-historic Remains of Caithness, London, 8vo., 1866

LATHAM (Robert Gordon) Ethnology of the British Islands, London, 8vo., 1852

LEWES (G. H.) The Life of Goethe, London, 8vo., 1864

LEWES (G. H.) Biographical History of Philosophy, London, 12mo., 1852

LEWES (G. H.) Aristotle, London, 8vo., 1864

LHUYD (Edward) Archæologia Britannica, Oxford, folio, 1707

LINGARD (John) History of England (5th edition), London, 8vo., 1849

LUBBOCK (J.) Pre-historic Times, London, 8vo., 1865

LYELL (Sir Charles) The Antiquity of Man, London, 8vo., 1863

MACKINTOSH (Sir Jas.) History of England, London, 8vo., 1830

MARCELLINUS, *see* Monumenta Historica Britannica

MAYHEW (Henry) German Life and Manners, as seen in Saxony at the present day, London, 8vo., 1864

MELA, *see* Monumenta Historica Britannica

MENZEL (Wolfgang) Die deutsche Literatur, Stuttgart, 12mo., 1828

MILL (John Stuart) System of Logic (third edition), London, 8vo., 1851

Monumenta Historica Britannica, (Petrie and Sharpe) London, folio, 1848. Especially the extracts from :—

Pomponius Mela
Claudius Ptolemæus
Ammianus Marcellinus
Procopius
Jornandes
Xiphilinus
Gildæ Sapientis De Excidio Britanniæ Liber Querulus. Historia et Epistola
Venerabilis Bædæ Chronicon, sive de sex Ætatibus sæculi
Venerabilis Bædæ Historiæ Ecclesiasticæ Gentis Anglorum libri quinque
The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle
Asser. Annales rerum gestarum Ælfredi Magni
Fabii Ethelwardi Chronicorum libri quatuor

Motley (John Lothrop, D.C.L.) History of the United Netherlands, London, 8vo., 1860

Muellek (Carl Ottfried) Denkmäler der alten Kunst, Göttingen, folio, 1832–54

Müller (Max) Lectures on the Science of Language (third edition), London, 8vo., 1862

Myvyrian Archaiology of Wales, The, London, 4to., 1801–7

Niebuhr (B. G.) Kleine historische und philologische Schriften, Bonn, 8vo., 1828–43

Norris (Edwin) The Ancient Cornish Drama, Oxford, 8vo., 1859

Penny Cyclopædia, The, London, 4to., 1833, &c. The articles 'Britain,' 'Picts,' 'Poetry,' 'Temperament,' and others

Philological Society, Transactions of the, during the years 1855 and 1857, London, 8vo. Principally the papers by the Rev. John Davies on the Races of Lancashire, and on the Connexion of the Celtic with the Teutonic languages

Platonis Respublica, ed. Caspar Orellius et Georgius Baiterus, Zurich, 8vo., 1847

Pliny, Ed. Valpy, London, 8vo., 1826

Pouchet (Georges) Pluralité des Races Humaines, Paris, 8vo., 1864

Price (T.) Essay on the Physiognomy and Physiology of the Present Inhabitants of Britain, London, 8vo., 1829

Prichard (James Cowles) Researches into the Physical History of Mankind (third edition), London, 8vo., 1836–47

Prichard (James Cowles) The Eastern Origin of the Celtic Nations, ed. G. R. Latham, London, 8vo., 1857

PROCOPIUS, *see* Monumenta Historica Britannica

PTOLEMY, *see* Monumenta Historica Britannica

PUGHE (W. Owen) Dictionary of the Welsh Language, Denbigh, 4to., 1832

QUETELET (L. A. J.) A treatise on Man, edited by T. Smibert, Edinburgh, 8vo., 1842

QUETELET (L. A. J.) Sur l'Homme, Paris, 8vo., 1835

RAPIN-THOYRAS (Paul de) The History of England written in French. Translated by N. Tindal (second edition). London, folio, 1732–36

RASK (E. C.) Grammar of the Anglo-Saxon Tongue. Translated by Thorpe, London, 8vo., 1865

RAWLINSON (G.) The History of Herodotus, London, 8vo., 1858

Reports from the Commissioners on the Public Records, London, folio, 1800–1819

RETZIUS (Anders) Ethnologische Schriften, nach dem Tode des Verfassers gesammelt, Stockholm, 4to., 1864

RUSKIN (John) Modern Painters, London, 8vo., 1851–60.

SANDIFORT (Gerardus) Tabulæ craniorum diversarum nationum, Leyden, folio, 1838–43

SCHLEGEL (A. W.) Vorlesungen über dramatische Kunst, Leipzig, 8vo., 1846

SCHMID (Reinhold) Die Gesetze der Angelsachsen in England, Leipzig, 8vo., 1858

SISMONDI (J. C. L. Simonde de) Histoire des Français, Paris, 8vo., 1821–44

SMILES (Samuel) Lives of Boulton and Watt, London, 8vo., 1865

SOLINUS (C. T.) Polyhistor, Paris, 8vo. 1533

SPURRELL (William) Dictionary of the Welsh Language, Eng. Welsh and Welsh Eng., Carmarthen, 8vo., 1859–61

STORY (William Wetmore) Roba di Roma (2nd edition), London, 8vo., 1863

STRABO, Ed. C. Müller, Paris, 8vo., 1853

SUETONIUS, Ed. Valpy, London, 8vo., 1826

TACITI (C. Cornelii) Opera Omnia, ad fidem editionis Orellianæ, Oxon, 8vo., 1854

TAYLOR (Isaac) Words and Places, London, 8vo., 1864

TAYLOR (W.) Historic Survey of German Poetry, London, 8vo., 1828–30

THIERRY (Amédée) Histoire des Gaulois (3rd edition), Paris, 8vo., 1844

THORPE (Benjamin) History of England under the Anglo-Saxon Kings (translated from the German of Lappenberg), London, 8vo., 1845

THURNAM (Dr. J.) *see* Davis (Dr. Barnard)

THURNAM (Dr. J.) On the two principal forms of Ancient British and Gaulish Skulls; printed among the Memoirs of the Anthropological Society of London, vol. i., London, 8vo., 1865

TODD (Robt. B.) Cyclopædia of Anatomy and Science, London, 8vo., 1849–52, article 'Temperament'

TURNER (Sharon) History of England, London, 8vo., 1839

VISCONTI (E. Q.) Iconographie Grecque, Paris, 4to. and folio, 1811

VOGT (Carl) Lectures on Man; His place in Creation and in the History of the Earth. Edited by Dr. Jas. Hunt, London, 8vo., 1864

WAITZ (Dr. Theodor) Introduction to Anthropology. Edited by J. Frederick Collingwood, London, 8vo., 1863

WILBERFORCE (Edward) Social Life in Munich, London, 12mo., 1864

WILSON (Daniel) Physical Characteristics of the Ancient and Modern Celt of Gaul and Britain. Anthropological Review, vol. iii., London, 8vo., 1865

WORNUM (Ralph N.) The Epochs of Painting, London, 12mo., 1847

WORSAAE (J. J. A.) An account of the Danes and Norwegians in England, London, 8vo., 1852

WRIGHT (Thos.) Essays on Archæological Subjects, London, 12mo., 1861

WRIGHT (Thos.) Essay on Gildas, in the Biographia Britannica Literaria, published by the Royal Society of Literature of the United Kingdom, London, 8vo., 1842, &c.

WRIGHT (Thos.) The Celt, the Roman, and the Saxon (second edition), London, 8vo., 1861

XIPHILINUS, *see* Monumenta Historica Britannica

ZEUSS (J. C.) Grammatica Celtica, Leipzig, 8vo., 1853

CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTION.

Object of the essay—Principles of investigation—Direct evidence and circumstantial evidence—Question whether there are any laws established in ethnology—Mr. Buckle—Dr. Knox—Mr. Darwin—Dr. Paul Broca—M. Georges Pouchet—The laws of human hybridity not yet established—Apology for the controversial character of the essay. . . . . PAGE 1

CHAPTER I.

THE HISTORICAL EVIDENCE.

The popular belief and its historical basis—Gildas's testimony and its value—The earliest inhabitants of Britain according to the Triads—Historical value of the Triads—Character of the population immediately before the Roman occupation—Character of the population when the Romans quitted Britain—First arrival of the Saxons—Probable effect of the Saxon ascendancy—Probable effect of the Danish ascendancy—Probable effect of the Norman conquest—Probable changes in the character of the population after the Norman conquest. 15

CHAPTER II.

THE PHILOLOGICAL EVIDENCE.

General estimate of the value of philological evidence—English not a truly Teutonic language, but hybrid even in its grammatical forms—Evidence of certain elements in modern English—The names of the principal geographical features—The names of the minor geographical features—Evidence of certain peculiarities of English pronunciation—No real doubt what was the language of the

ancient Britons; its resemblance to the language of ancient Gaul—Early prevalence of a high Celtic element in Gaul and Northern Italy—These facts are important because they tend to explain certain difficulties connected with ancient British skulls—Reasons for and against the identification of the words Cimmerii, Cimbri, and Cymry—Attempt to discover an ancient Cymric or high Celtic civilisation with which our modern English civilisation may be compared—Philology points in the direction of Greece—Comparison of words in the Greek and Cymric languages—Importance of this comparison as showing the civilisation of the ancient Britons—Greek and Cymric conform in type, when their type differs from that of other Aryan languages—Coincidence of the philological evidence with the evidence of tradition and of some fragments of history—The Celtic and Germanic languages—Philological evidence of a pre-Celtic element in Britain considered—Sense in which the term Cymry is used in this essay . . . . . PAGE 65

CHAPTER III.

THE EVIDENCE OF PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS.

Evidence for the popular belief—The prevailing colour of the hair in England—Examination of the evidence respecting the prevailing colour of the hair among the ancient Germans, Gauls, Britons, and Anglo-Saxons—Examination of certain modern theories—General results of the investigation—Examination of the evidence respecting the stature, proportions, and general appearance of the above-mentioned ancient peoples—The modern English do not owe their stature exclusively, if at all, to the Saxons or Danes—The evidence of skulls and remains found in ancient burying places—The 'Crania Britannica'—The difficulty presented by the discovery both of the long and of the short forms of skulls in the most ancient burying-places—Evidence that the long oval skull is characteristic of the Cymry—The typical English head is also of the long-oval form, while the typical Teutonic head is of the short oval form—General results of the investigation—The predecessors of the Cymry in Britain were possibly Cymro-Turanians, some dolichocephalic, some brachycephalic—Agreement of the physical characteristics of the ancient Greeks with those of the ancient Britons and modern English 131

CHAPTER IV.

THE EVIDENCE OF PSYCHICAL CHARACTERISTICS.

Necessity for a good division and classification of psychical phenomena—That of Professor Bain the simplest, and therefore best adapted to

our purpose—The athletic character of the English, their extraordinary will and energy traceable to a pre-Teutonic rather than to a Teutonic source—Manifestation of the same characteristics by the ancient Greeks—Wonder the characteristic emotion of the Germans, not of the English—The sense of decency in England and abroad—Patriotism in the English and in foreigners—Resemblance of the Druidic philosophy to some forms of Greek philosophy—Eloquence of Britons, Greeks, and English—Constructive powers in Greeks, Britons, Germans, and English, as shown especially in mechanical skill and inventions, in the drama, in architecture, in music, and in painting—The power of detecting hidden resemblances, and the power of retaining past impressions, as shown especially in the poetry, the philosophy and the science of Greece, Germany, and England—Certain moral characteristics corresponding to the intellectual characteristics—General agreement of the Greek character with the English, and with what is known of the ancient British character . . . . . PAGE 179

CHAPTER V.

RESULTS OF THE ENQUIRY 238

CHAPTER VI.

THE UTILITY OF ETHNOLOGICAL INVESTIGATIONS.

Popular objections—Ethnology the only science which can unfold the correlations of mind with body, or of the mental faculties with one another—Emotional differences not dependent on different forms of skull—Intellectual differences probably have some connexion with different forms of skull—Correlations of mental faculties one with another—The knowledge of these correlations is necessary for a good system of Education—Variety a necessary element in education—The Englishman possesses great advantages in the varied aspects of his country—Ethnology essential to history—Reasons for entitling this work 'A Prologue to Authentic English History' 249

ERRATA.

P. 52, line 15, *for* number *read* numbers.

P. 111, line 4, *for* λιπος *read* λίπος.

P. 155, First Note, *for* Race *read* Races.

THE ENGLISH AND THEIR ORIGIN.

INTRODUCTION.

Object of the Essay—Principles of Investigation—Direct Evidence and Circumstantial Evidence—Question whether there are any Laws established in Ethnology—Mr. Buckle—Dr. Knox—Mr. Darwin—Dr. Paul Broca—M. Georges Pouchet—The laws of Human Hybridity not yet established—Apology for the controversial character of the Essay.

In all scientific enquiries directed towards a definite point, it is necessary to keep that point distinctly in view from first to last; it is necessary to lay down clearly, beforehand, the principles upon which the enquiry is to be conducted, and to determine what kind of evidence may be admitted; it is necessary also to ascertain whether there exist any well-ascertained laws of general application to the science which embraces the particular question at issue.

The object of the present essay is not to discover who were absolutely the first inhabitants of our island, because, in the present state of science, finality seems almost impossible; it is impossible to have any certainty that some new excavation may not at any moment bring to light human remains differing

in all their characteristics, and in the probable period of their interment, from any that have yet been found. The object is simply to compare all the information that may be collected, bearing upon the people or peoples who are supposed to have inhabited our island at different times, and upon the people or peoples with whom they may probably be connected; on such a comparison must be based any conclusion that may be arrived at.

There are probably few historians or ethnologists who will deny that a satisfactory result can be attained only by a careful investigation of every kind of evidence; but there are unfortunately few who have given due attention to every branch of the subject. Each one, strong in his own favourite study, has generally considered that particular study —philology, anatomy, or physiology, as the case might be—to be almost coextensive with ethnology. To this general rule there have been some great exceptions, and the greatest among them was Prichard. He saw the value of every kind of evidence; where any kind of evidence was wanting, he endeavoured to discover it; and where he failed to discover, he was not slow to acknowledge the importance of the testimony which was wanting. Some of the evidence, for which Prichard sighed, has since been brought to light in the 'Crania Britannica,' the valuable work of Dr. Barnard Davis and Dr. Thurnam. An attempt will be made in the fourth chapter of this essay to show that Professor Bain's division and classification

of mental phenomena now enable us to compare the psychical characteristics of different peoples with greater accuracy than formerly. And the general progress of science during the past few years has had a tendency to foster a truly scientific spirit in all investigations, and to repress the enthusiastic vagaries of men who grow drunk with the first taste of knowledge.

By those who have given the slightest attention to the progress of scientific discovery 'the general doctrines of science are never,' as Mr. G. H. Lewes has well remarked,* 'like those of theology and metaphysics, conceived to be final. However firmly fixed at present, they may be shaken to-morrow by a new discovery.' And this remark is especially true of so young a science as the Science of Man. All who approach it should approach it in a spirit of humility—not arrogantly assuming that they may snatch off the veil at the first attempt, but modestly hoping that a little of it may be raised in response to their persistent efforts.

Of all evidence, the trustworthy historical testimony of contemporaries is most valuable; it is so valuable that, where it exists and gives full details, all other evidence is superfluous. The first duty therefore of anyone who enters upon an enquiry like the present is to ascertain whether any such trustworthy historical testimony exists. If the direct

* *Aristotle*, p. 33.

evidence breaks down, or is incomplete, it becomes necessary to rely, if the term may be used, upon circumstantial evidence; and the value of such evidence should not be under-rated. A number of circumstances all pointing in the same direction—some very significant, others perhaps trifling, when considered alone—will often suffice to condemn a man to death; they cannot therefore be insufficient to establish a strong presumption in favour of an ethnological theory. And it will be found that, in this enquiry at least, the circumstantial evidence does not consist of any single train of reasoning, but of several independent trains. Take any one of those trains of reasoning, show that the original premises are false, that the conclusions do not follow from the premises, that the whole of that particular train of reasoning is beside the question—still you leave all the other trains of reasoning in full force. This kind of circumstantial evidence is not a chain as weak as its weakest part; it is a number of independent chains, of which perhaps any one singly may suffice to bear the weight hung upon the whole collectively; or, to change the metaphor, such evidence is like a river, which derives its volume and its force from several distinct springs—some of which may cease to flow without sensibly diminishing the force or volume of the river—all of which must cease to flow before the river can cease to exist.

On such evidence it will hereafter appear that English ethnology must be based. The main sources,

perhaps it is not too much to say the only sources, of that evidence are the languages, the physical characteristics, and the psychical characteristics of the different tribes or peoples with whom there is reason to suppose that the ancestors of the English have had any connection. But all this evidence must be submitted to a most careful examination. That which at first sight appears to be good evidence may, after investigation, prove to be no evidence at all;—it may even prove to be evidence pointing in a direction opposite to that in which it was at first supposed to point. Both the direct and the circumstantial evidence must be thoroughly sifted, must at least be shown to be not mere fictions, before they can be admitted as a basis for argument. It is to the neglect of this precaution that the absurdly contradictory theories of different ethnologists may be traced.

And now the question arises—are there, amidst all these contradictions, any well-established ethnological laws which will help us in our enquiry? Among English speculators in the science there are two who have laid down laws diametrically opposed to each other. Dr. Knox assures us* that race is everything, and the surrounding circumstances—the medium, to use the term employed by some French writers—nothing. Races, he tells us, are unchangeable; they may be transported to different parts of

* *The Races of Men*, passim.

the world, to all climates; but in all climates, in all parts of the world, they are the same; they may die, but they cannot change; and if they are transported far from their original seat they must and they will die out. The evidence adduced in support of this great law is of the weakest possible character; met by the monstrous contradiction flung at him by the inhabitants of America, who are of African or mixed European descent, Dr. Knox is compelled to offer us, as evidence, his opinion of the future destiny of the European colonies in the western hemisphere.

Mr. Buckle, not less audacious in his statements, has asserted,* not that race is everything, but that race is nothing. His theory is, that man owes his disposition and character solely to the medium—to the general aspect of nature—to climate, food, and soil. Always consistent with himself, Mr. Buckle is in this case compelled to deny† the transmission of character, of temperament, of all bodily or mental peculiarities, from ancestor to descendant; he is compelled to deny any progressive improvement in the faculties of man, to deny 'that those faculties are likely to be greater in an infant born in the most civilised part of Europe, than in one born in the wildest region of a barbarous country.'

It may be worth while to compare these two opposite theories with that of Mr. Darwin. It is

* *The History of Civilisation in England*, vol. i. chap. 2.

† *Ibid.* chap. 4.

certain that Dr. Knox and Mr. Buckle have, between them, succeeded in accomplishing what might, if the feat had not been performed, have appeared an impossibility; they have succeeded in forming two opposite theories, neither of which agrees with the theory of Mr. Darwin. Mr. Buckle is at variance with Mr. Darwin, because, while he admits any amount of change, he will not admit any transmissible improvement; Dr. Knox is at variance with Mr. Darwin, because he will admit neither any improvement nor any change whatever. It is almost incredible that two such statements should have come from two men, both of whom have displayed considerable ability, and one of whom attained an erudition perhaps altogether unparalleled. If there is any one physiological fact which is indisputable, it is that peculiarities physical, mental, and pathological are transmitted from ancestor to descendant; * if there is any one fact of which history can assure us, it is that the average intellectual condition of the English people is far higher than the average intellectual condition of any people which may claim to be our ancestors.

It is not necessary, for our present purpose, either to accept or to reject the hypothesis of Mr. Darwin, that species have arisen by 'natural selection.' But Mr. Darwin has collected a mass of evidence which is

* For evidence of this fact see especially Mr. Darwin's work on *The Origin of Species*, and Mr. Combe's *Constitution of Man.*

of the utmost value in our present enquiry; he has collected a mass of evidence which is sufficient to establish the fact that certain peculiarities sometimes appear in the offspring which do not appear in the parents, and that such peculiarities are in their turn transmitted to the next generation in the same manner as other characteristics of older date. That characteristics in general are transmitted is established beyond all doubt by Mr. Darwin's evidence—if indeed any doubt could exist of the fact before his work appeared. And by his evidence, coupled with the evidence from the Egyptian monuments, is beyond all question established the law that the principal characteristics of a people endure for ages, provided always that the people is not subjected to any considerable admixture of foreign blood, or to any great variation of climate or medium.

Without this law to rely upon, it would be impossible to draw any satisfactory conclusions from the physical characteristics of different peoples at the present time. With this law to rely upon, the argument from well-marked physical characteristics becomes of the highest value, while any minor deviations from a given type are satisfactorily explained by the law of variation.

But this great law can assist us only when we have reason to suppose that there has been no considerable admixture of foreign blood. The laws of human hybridity have yet to be established. Attempts have already been made to establish those laws, but the

conclusions arrived at are supported by assertions rather than by facts. It is a remarkable circumstance that Dr. Knox, Dr. Paul Broca, and M. Georges Pouchet have all arrived at very similar conclusions on this point. Of these three writers, Dr. Broca has perhaps brought forward the strongest array of evidence; but that evidence relates to the intermixture of peoples which are most widely different from each other, and is, from the nature of the subject, very uncertain. These three writers deny that all the races of mankind are, for any length of time, prolific one with another; but Dr. Broca, more moderate in his views than the other two, seems disposed to admit that certain groups of human races may be indefinitely prolific one with another, though not with different groups;* and he says explicitly,† 'It appears to me certain that the Cymry and Celts, when crossed either one with the other or with the Romans and Germans, constitute examples of eugenesic‡ hybridity.'

But not all ethnologists are so moderate, or so careful in the collection of evidence. It seems to be the creed of Dr. Knox that races are well marked, immutable, incapable of intermixture; he will not admit even development; he will admit nothing but

* *Des Phénomènes d'Hybridité dans le Genre Humain*, p. 607.

† *Ibid.* p. 617.

‡ '*Hybridité eugénésique*,' a technical term used by Dr. Broca to signify that the two races can produce a hybrid progeny which is self-supporting and prolific *ad infinitum*. I ought perhaps to explain further that Dr. Broca uses the word *Celt* in a restricted sense. He applies it to a particular race found chiefly in the centre and south of France.

race pure and simple.* His evidence consists of a few assertions concerning the physical and psychical peculiarities of certain peoples, which will be considered in another part of this essay.

M. Pouchet is hardly less vehement in his assertions than Dr. Knox. He assures us† that 'an intermediate type cannot exist by itself, but solely on condition of being supported by the two types from which it springs;' and he tells us further 'when two types unite, a two-fold phenomenon may be observed; either, on the one hand, one of the two types absorbs the other, or, on the other hand, they both continue to exist, one by the side of, and independent of the other.'‡

These are startling laws, if, indeed, they are laws at all. And M. Pouchet, unlike Dr. Broca, does not hesitate to apply them to the inhabitants of England. 'Two distinct races,' he tells us,§ 'divide Great Britain between them; or, at least, the representatives of two races are found there; and, in the midst of an immense number of individual peculiarities derived from both stocks,‖ the least practised eye is not slow to distinguish these two original types, which are as different as any two human beings with fair complexions can be. One of these two races is composed of big, strong, powerful men, with transparent skins, and blue eyes; the other has a more tawny skin,

* *The Races of Men*, passim.
† *Pluralité des Races Humaines*, p. 117. ‡ *Ibid.* p. 149.
§ *Ibid.* pp. 152-4. ‖ '*Individualités intermédiaires.*'

and black curling hair. The first were formerly called Caledonians; the second were called Silurians, and were very like the Iberians of the Spanish peninsula: the one of Celtic or southern origin, the other of German or northern origin. No one denies, at the present day, that these two races are well marked; and perfect specimens of either are met with in England every day. Even the particular districts have been pointed out, where the Silurian, Iberian, or Celtic race is predominant, in accordance with tradition, viz. the north-west of Glamorganshire, the neighbourhood of Merthyr, and the Vale of Neath. Mr. John Phillips finds them equally numerous, with the same characteristics, in the district of the Danelag, between Leicester, Nottingham, and Derby. Among the two races there necessarily live a considerable number of half-breeds, who, intermarrying with one or other original stock, or among themselves, produce new varieties, and so connect the two groups by a multiplicity of shades which merge imperceptibly into one another.'

The last part of M. Pouchet's statement seems to be hardly consistent with the first. If the intermarriages of half-breeds are fertile, and if M. Pouchet can assign no limit to the fertility of their descendants, it is difficult to understand why there may not, potentially at least, exist a self-supporting nation of mixed blood. If M. Pouchet means to assert no more than that the proportions of blood in the mixed people will be frequently disturbed by admixtures

with either parent stock, in those cases where the two parent stocks have survived, his second law is no more than an obvious truism.

But M. Pouchet has not adduced a reasonable amount of evidence in support of either law; he has scarcely even succeeded in making out a *prima facie* case for enquiry. The passage last quoted is not an unfair specimen of M. Pouchet's method of arguing; and for that reason, among others, it has been quoted. The Celts are assumed to be in all respects identical with the Iberians or Basques; a single statement made by Tacitus, with respect to Silurians and Iberians, is accepted as evidence establishing the physical characteristics of the whole of the Celts; the problem of ethnography is, so far as England is concerned, solved by a stroke of the pen, and the conclusion arrived at is used in support of an excessively doubtful theory. M. Pouchet certainly has not duly appreciated the difficulties which surround this one branch of the subject; to the other branches he seems to have given even less attention. It will not, therefore, be prudent to accept M. Pouchet's laws as data, in investigating the origin of the English people.

The laws of human hybridity are not yet ascertained. Had it been established that no mixed race or people can exist, the principal question for investigation would perhaps have been—Did the Saxons absorb the Britons, or did the Britons absorb the Saxons? As it has not been demonstrated that one or other

of those events must necessarily have occurred, it remains only to examine the question in all its phases, and to banish all prejudices which may be the result of early education, or of that kind of hero-worship which is sometimes paid to men of science.

It has already been found necessary to speak freely of the theories advanced by men who are eminent, and deservedly eminent, in some branches of enquiry; and it will be found necessary to speak freely again and again. There are some subjects which it is impossible to discuss without controversy; there are some writers whom it is impossible to disregard. To write an essay on the origin of the English people, to advance theories at variance with most of those which have gone before, and at the same time to pass over in silence the opposite views of well-known authors, would be to incur the suspicion of ignorance.

But the necessity for controversy is not a disadvantage in any attempt to arrive at the truth. It is by the aid of controversy that evidence may best be brought to light, and sifted. Controversy is one of the leading principles in all courts of justice, and its object is to discover the true value of evidence. In this essay it has been found impossible to sift the evidence carefully without entering into controversy; and it is upon the estimate of evidence—upon the relative weight attached to different kinds of evidence—upon the rejection of evidence, apparently conclusive but really valueless—upon the establishment of collateral proofs, at first sight apparently of no value

but really of very high value—upon the attempt to work out each particular head of evidence fairly, and without suppression or distortion—that the conclusion must depend for its validity.

But in the attempt to balance evidence, to expose fallacies, to show that assertions sometimes pass current for facts, it may be hoped that the bounds of courtesy will not in any case be passed over; even those works from which the author of this essay has seen most reason to dissent—the conclusions of which he considers least in accordance with facts—have proved, in almost all instances, suggestive, and have assisted not a little in enabling him to obtain results of his own.

CHAPTER I.

THE HISTORICAL EVIDENCE.

The Popular Belief, and its Historical Basis—Gildas's testimony, and its value—The earliest inhabitants of Britain, according to the Triads—Historical value of the Triads—Character of the population immediately before the Roman occupation—Character of the population when the Romans quitted Britain—First arrival of the Saxons—Probable effect of the Saxon ascendancy—Probable effect of the Danish ascendancy—Probable effect of the Norman conquest—Probable changes in the character of the population after the Norman conquest.

THERE are probably few educated Englishmen living who have not in their infancy been taught that the English nation is a nation of almost pure Teutonic blood, that its political constitution, its social customs, its internal prosperity, the success of its arms, and the number of its colonies have all followed necessarily upon the arrival, in three vessels, of certain German warriors under the command of Hengist and Horsa. Hengist and Horsa are a necessary part of a child's education; so are Rowena, and Vortigern, and the Heptarchy, and many other pretty stories, which have found their way, under the disguise of facts, into respectable histories. The press even now seems generally to assume that

the ordinary Englishman does not carry his historical criticism beyond the point which it reached in his childhood; and a Cambridge Professor* of History does not scruple to dilate upon the merits of 'our Teutonic race.' When a new discovery is made by a diligent search for facts, by a cautious or a brilliant generalisation, and by an ingenious series of experiments, the Teutonic intellect receives its meed of praise; when a war is satisfactorily concluded, it is Teutonic energy and perseverance which accomplish the feat; when a trading treaty is ratified between England and some effete eastern power, it is the commercial enterprise of the Teutonic race which triumphs over every obstacle. When Germany is in distress, we are invariably reminded that Germans are our kinsmen; when she does wrong, we are to judge her mercifully, because we have much in common with her, and have ere now sinned just as she has sinned.

It is hard to root out a prejudice, hardest of all when that prejudice has sprung out of statements made by historians of known ability, by historians whose sceptical turn of mind might almost be considered a guarantee that no worthless testimony could be accepted by them as trustworthy. A man, more than ordinarily well informed, might with reason appeal to Hume as an authority, might assume that the critic who distrusted the Gospels would not,

* Rev. Charles Kingsley, *The Roman and the Teuton*, p. 1 and elsewhere.

without good cause, rely upon Gildas. The public must be guided by the historians who have consulted the original authorities, and cannot consult those authorities for itself; it must always follow a leader, and it is perhaps a matter of chance which leader it follows; the first comer is the first to be heard. And so, in this case, although Dr. Lappenberg, and Mr. Thorpe, and Mr. Kemble have already shown that Hume's history of Saxon England is not infallible, the Englishman is as firmly convinced as ever that he is beyond all doubt a Teuton.

But in entering upon an enquiry like the present, it is necessary—if possible—not only to root out our prejudices, but to come to the subject as nearly as may be in that state of mind in which we come to an entirely new study. It is difficult even for the most philosophical and the most conscientious to do this, to deal with a prejudice so that it shall neither leave the mind with a little of its former bias nor with a little of a new bias acquired by the reaction. But though the attainment of this frame of mind is hardly to be hoped for, an approximation to it may be not impossible.

In this case, perhaps, the safest way to deal with an old prejudice will be to examine it by itself. Let us then pass at once from the histories on which it is founded to those chroniclers who have handed down to us their version of the Saxon conquest. Of such chroniclers the name is Legion: the scope of their

works is somewhat ambitious; they generally aim at nothing less than universal history, beginning with the creation and ending with their own era; but inasmuch as they almost invariably copy, and copy verbatim, from their predecessors, it is not very difficult to travel backwards to the truly original authority.

To use the words of Mr. Hardy,* 'the materials for our history during the first five centuries (which may properly be called the British period) must be sought for, and are to be found, only in notices and incidental allusions in the works of the classical and Byzantine writers, in coins and monumental inscriptions, in the record of oral traditions, in the writings of Gildas and Nennius, and in the lives of the Saints. In the "Anglo-Saxon" period, history becomes more important, though it does not appear to have become a favourite study; at least, to judge from the few regular historical productions that have reached us: Beda, Athelweard, Asser, and the Saxon Chronicle are all that remain.'

It is hardly necessary to remark here that the value of any writer's testimony must depend principally on the period at which he lived. Those authors who have lived contemporaneously with any given events, stand in the first rank of credibility when writing of those events; those authors who have belonged to

* *Descriptive Catalogue of Materials relating to the History of Great Britain and Ireland*, by Thomas Duffus Hardy, Deputy Keeper of the Public Records, published by the Authority of the Lords Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury, under the Direction of the Master of the Rolls, preface, vol. i. p. xii.

the generation immediately following stand in the second rank, because they may have obtained their information from contemporaries; those writers who have had no means of procuring information from contemporaries are trustworthy only so far as their authorities are trustworthy. In searching for the historical foundation of the popular prejudice which we are now discussing, we shall find it very easy to eliminate most of our authorities. Only those who lived contemporaneously with, or in the generation next following, the final settlement of the Saxons in England, can tell us how far they carried their conquest—whether they annihilated the vanquished, or enslaved them, or intermarried with them and lived on equal terms with them.

And of all the authorities usually quoted, there is only one who falls even within the second rank. The Saxon Chronicle, whoever may be its authors, gives, for this period, little more than a bare catalogue of Saxon kings. Asser gives us no more than the biography of Alfred the Great: Athelweard did not live earlier than the tenth century. Between Nennius and Gildas there is a curious confusion, for the work of Nennius, 'Historia Britonum,' is commonly headed 'Gildæ Sapientis Historia Britonum.' Yet Gildas, as we shall see, must certainly, if he lived at all, have lived before the time of Beda; while of Nennius all that we can say is, in the words of Mr. Hardy,*

* *Materials relating to the History of Great Britain and Ireland*, vol. i. p. 320.

'It appears that Nennius, author of the "Historia Britonum," was the disciple of Elbod; that he was born during the latter part of the eighth and was living in the ninth century; that he compiled his history by order of his superior, and completed it in the year 858; that he was connected with a priest called Beulan, whom he styles master, and to whom he seems to have addressed a copy of his compilation; that he inscribed certain verses to Samuel the son of Beulan, for whose information he appears occasionally to have glossed his work; and that he belonged to some community either of the regular or secular clergy.

'The few facts above mentioned are all that can be gleaned from the author's own statements relative to himself; but it is most probable that he was a native of Wales, since nearly all his narrative has reference to that portion of the realm.'

If we now consider the value of Beda's account, we discover that he was born about the year 672,* that he did not therefore, in all probability, begin to write before the eighth century; and that his authority for the all-important period in our discussion is Gildas.

Who then was Gildas? When did he live? How far may we trust him? By the answers to these three questions must we decide whether the popular opinion that the Englishman is an 'Anglo-Saxon' has

* *Materials, &c.* vol. i. pp. 445–6.

a satisfactory basis in history—for, so far as history is concerned, Gildas is the only authority an Englishman can appeal to, in support of that opinion. With the other grounds for that opinion we shall deal in due time. It is Gildas, and Gildas only, who has suggested the theory to English historians.

Who then was Gildas? He has two biographers, who give accounts of his life so very different from one another, that the question has arisen, was there one Gildas or more, and if more, how many? The two biographers are Caradoc of Llancarvan, who is supposed to have lived in the twelfth century, and a certain monk of Ruys near Rennes, who lived probably in the tenth *or* eleventh century.* One of these authorities tells us that Gildas had three-and-twenty brothers, the other that he had four. Both, however, agree in giving him a Scotch king for a father, though one calls the king *Nau* and the other *Caunus*—names perhaps not very dissimilar. Both, too, give an account of a miraculous bell, but each gives his own version. There is nevertheless a certain amount of similarity between the two biographies; and, on the supposition that they are biographies of one and the same person, it is possible to give an account of Gildas which may bring him within the second rank of trustworthy witnesses—trustworthy, that is, so far as certain facilities for ascertaining facts can make a witness trustworthy.

* See Mr. Hardy's *Materials relating to the History of Great Britain and Ireland*, vol. i. pp. 151 and 155.

Mr. Hardy,* having apparently more faith in the statements found in Gildas's own work than in those of his biographers, says :—

'Gildas or Gildus, by some surnamed the Wise, by others Badonicus, is said to have been born in Britain, in the year of the siege of Mount Badon, circa A.D. 516, and to have exercised some kind of ecclesiastical function. He went into Armorica about the year 550, where he composed his Epistle. He himself states that he took ten years to consider and mature his work, which will bring its composition to the year 560.'

Nor is this account in itself improbable. Some one, no matter whether we call him Gildas or not, did certainly write a historical work at some time between the battle of Mons Badonicus and the date of Beda's Ecclesiastical History, and did assert† that he was born on the day on which the battle was fought. Thus much we know from Beda. Gildas might therefore have heard from living men the whole story of the Saxon settlement. He might, at twenty, have heard, from men of sixty, an account of all the important events that occurred less than half a century after the date usually assigned to the landing of Hengist and Horsa. Any statement made

* *Materials, &c.* vol. i. p. 137.

† Unless, as Mr. Wright suggests, this passage is an interpolation. He, however, regards the whole work as a forgery of the seventh century. See *Biographia Litera ia Britannica.* Article 'Gildas.'

by such an authority as this must be accepted as most valuable evidence, unless it can, in any way, be shown that there is very strong reason to doubt it.

Allowing, then, that Gildas*—no matter who he may have been—lived in the middle of the sixth century, we come to our third and most important question—how far may we trust him? The answer to that question must be sought for, firstly in the account which the author himself gives of the manner in which he obtained his information, and secondly, where possible, by a comparison of the account given by him of any events with the accounts given by authors whose credibility is ascertained.

Now, to do Gildas justice, he does not claim for his work the character of a faithful and accurate account of the events which he relates; but it does nevertheless seem possible, according to his own showing, that he might have derived information from eye-witnesses. He tells us that he compiled his history, 'not from any British written documents (because, *if there ever were any*, they were either burnt by the enemy or carried across sea by the fugitives), but from accounts obtained abroad, which must necessarily be obscure by reason of the numerous gaps which they leave in the narrative.'†

* As the conclusions arrived at in this essay are opposed to the statements of Gildas, it is well to allow him the benefit of every doubt.

† Gildas, *De Excidio Britanniæ* ap. *Monumenta Historica*

This certainly may be a reason why the narrative should be incomplete, but it is no reason why the narrative should not be accurate as far as it goes. If Gildas obtained his information beyond the seas, there does not appear to be any reason why he might not have obtained it from the fugitives of whom he tells us himself. If there were such fugitives, and if he was under the necessity of writing abroad, those fugitives ought to have been, and possibly were, consulted by him. On this hypothesis we may explain much that is otherwise unintelligible in Gildas's work. These emigrants, who probably lived at a much later period than that assigned to Hengist and Horsa, would certainly not be the best specimens of the British people; their duty, while the contest continued, lay in Britain, not in Armorica. Such men as these would naturally exaggerate the disasters of their countrymen, partly in order to justify their own conduct, partly from the

Britannica, p. 7. This is a paraphrase; to *translate* Gildas is generally impossible. It is perhaps worthy of remark that *si qua fuerint* looks suspiciously like a Saxon interpolation. Gildas, on his own showing, certainly ought to have known whether there were British documents or not, though he appears to have made no effort to consult any that may have existed. If we translate *si qua fuerint*, *whatever documents there may have been*, there is still a doubt implied of the existence of such documents. The expression *crebris irrupta intercapedinibus* may mean that the information was obtained at different times; but the intervals of time which may elapse between the narrations of different parts of a story afford not the slightest excuse for incoherence when the several parts are put together.

natural proneness of all human beings, and especially of an imaginative people, to exaggerate all great calamities and all great successes. Such stories as Gildas would hear from these Armorican Britons, when impressed on a mind of such a melancholic character as this author evidently possessed, could not fail to suggest a history as lugubrious as the 'De Excidio Britanniæ.' It is impossible even to glance either at 'The History' or at 'The Epistle,' without coming to the conclusion that the author's mind was in an unhealthy condition. Everything seemed black to him; all men were monsters of wickedness; all happiness and all goodness seemed to him to have departed from the world; and nothing remained but blank despair for himself and for all people. In short, he was melancholy-mad.

It is obvious, then, that we must receive any statements made by such a man as this with extreme caution. And it is doubly necessary to be cautious, when we find, coupled with a suggestion that the British records were carried across the sea, an admission that he made no attempt to discover them, though himself a sojourner amongst the exiles.* Gildas certainly does not endure the application of our first test in such a manner as to gain our confidence.

Let us now apply our second test, and examine

* It is of course possible that Gildas's *transmarina relatio* may have been obtained from Romans or Germans, or any other people who lived beyond the seas; but, if so, his testimony is as worthless as that of a man who lived a hundred years later.

how far Gildas's narrative of earlier events corresponds with the narratives of authors on whom we have reason to believe that we can rely. Cæsar* tells us that the Britons made an obstinate resistance to his landing, on his first expedition; that they availed themselves of every opportunity of falling upon his men; and that they fought well when he invaded the country a second time. Gildas,† on the other hand, asserts that they were an unwarlike and perfidious people; and that they were subjugated, 'not like other nations, by fire and sword, but solely by threats.'

Tacitus‡ says of the Britons of Agricola's time: 'They readily submit to levies, to the payment of tribute, to all those duties which our authority imposes on them, provided only that no injustice be committed; this they cannot endure, for, though reduced to subjection, they are not yet reduced to servitude.' Gildas tells a very different story. 'The Romans,' he says,§ 'returned to Italy, leaving behind them governors who had authority to apply the scourge to the backs of the Britons, the yoke to their necks, and the title of "Roman slave-state" to their country; so that the island could no longer be considered Britannia.'

Which of the two shall we believe—Tacitus or

* *De Bell. Gall.* lib. iv. v.

† *Monumenta Historica Britannica*, p. 7.

‡ *Agric.* ch. xiii.

§ *Monumenta Historica Britannica*, p. 8.

Gildas? No one would hesitate for a moment to answer, Tacitus. But if we arrive at the conclusion that Gildas gives not only an erroneous account, but an account directly opposed to truth, of those events which have been related by other historians, can we place any reliance upon him, when he is, or is supposed to be, the sole authority? It is quite as likely that he could have ascertained the truth from Cæsar and Tacitus as that he could have ascertained it from exiled Britons. And the mis-statements to which attention has just been called are not the only mis-statements of which Gildas has been guilty. To quote again from Mr. Hardy,*

'For his first period, the Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius in the version by Ruffinus, the Epistle of St. Jerome, and perhaps the Ecclesiastical History of Sulpicius Severus may be traced in his [Gildas's] pages; for the second period, his veracity must rest entirely on his own authority, as none of the contemporary Greek or Roman writers afford it any support, but rather the reverse; indeed, his statements relative to the abandonment of the island by the Romans from the time of Maximus, and the subsequent erection of the Roman wall, are wholly irreconcilable with their testimony. From the early part of the fifth century, however, when the Greek and Roman writers cease to notice the affairs of Britain, his narrative, on whatever authority

* *Materials for the History of Great Britain, &c.*, vol. i. p. 137, and *Monumenta Historica Britannica*, p. 60.

it may be founded, has been adopted without question by Beda and succeeding authors; and consequently accepted, notwithstanding its barrenness of facts and pompous obscurity, by all but general consent, as the basis of early English History.'

And again: *

'In his [Gildas's] narrative of the return of the Roman forces to succour the natives, he evidently either blunders or greatly exaggerates in his account of the Roman wall, the towns on the sea coast, and the destitute condition of the inhabitants. His statement of the manner in which he obtained his information, together with the recollection that he probably wrote considerably more than a century after those events, might perhaps plead as his apology for the confused and unsatisfactory manner in which he has performed his task, were it not apparent that he is much more meagre and vague in the account of the transactions of his own times than even in the preceding portions.'

From the foregoing investigation the conclusion forces itself upon us that, by itself, the History of Gildas cannot establish the 'Anglo-Saxon' theory. But before leaving this part of the subject, and attempting either to find some substitute for the popular opinion, or to confirm it from other sources of information, it may be well to call attention to what Gildas does say on the point.

He tells us of the pressure of the Picts upon the

* *Materials, &c.*, vol. i. p. 136.

Britons, and gives us the letter which the Britons sent to Ætius. This letter is so terse and so unlike the usual style of Gildas that there is some temptation to believe it genuine. If Gildas composed it, he succeeded in writing a line or two that may bear comparison with the best speeches to be found in Livy or Tacitus. 'The groans of the Britons,' the letter was headed. 'The barbarians, on the one hand, chase us into the sea; the sea, on the other, throws us back on the barbarians; and we have only the hard choice left us of perishing by the sword or by the waves.' *

Next follows the story of the Saxon invasion. 'Then a litter of whelps bursting forth from the lair of the lioness of Barbaric land, in three keels, as their language expresses it, or according to ours in three ships.' . . . It would be tedious to carry this sentence further, inasmuch as it is very long and very involved—a peculiarity of style for which Gildas more than once apologises.

The three keels evidently belong to fable-land; no three boat-loads of low Germans could have sufficed to conquer the Picts, or to secure a footing in Britain. Professor Donaldson, in his essay on English Ethnography,† suggests that these three boats indicate three divisions of invaders—the Saxons or Frisians, the Angles, and the Jutes. If this ingenious suggestion be well founded, it will not add to the credibility of an author who writes, in allegory, of

* The translation is Hume's.

† *Cambridge Essays*, 1856, p. 49.

events which happened less than seventy years before his birth. We have not yet allegorised the revolution, nor even the Norman Conquest.

But to return to Gildas; a few lines of his history suffice to record the successes of the Saxons and the disasters of the Britons. Then, he tells us, 'some of the miserable remnant [of the Britons] were overtaken in the mountains and slaughtered wholesale; others, subdued by hunger, went to the enemy, and gave themselves up to perpetual slavery on the sole condition that the butchery should cease—the highest favour they could ask; others sailed for lands beyond the seas.' *

From this passage, without doubt, originated the idea that all the Britons were exterminated, or driven into Wales and Armorica. But it must not be forgotten that a subsequent passage might lead us to a directly opposite conclusion. After relating the *victory* of the Britons at Mons Badonicus, Gildas remarks, 'but not even now are the cities inhabited as they were formerly, but up to the present time remain desolate and in ruins, for *though there are no longer any wars with foreigners, civil wars still continue.*' This and the preceding passage are so at variance with one another that, had we no other evidence to guide us, we should be in doubt whether the Saxons finally conquered the Britons, or the Britons the Saxons.

Having now examined the historical basis of the

* *Monumenta Historica Britannica*, p. 14.

popular opinion, and discovered that it cannot be relied on, we must enter upon a wider field of enquiry, and endeavour to ascertain what conclusions will most reasonably follow upon a careful comparison of all the historical and traditional evidence we can collect. We must no longer restrict ourselves to one particular period, but must work our way upwards from the earliest tradition to the Norman Conquest, and even to the present day. And in our investigation we must remember that the popular theory may still possibly be the true theory, though the evidence on which it is founded is insufficient to establish it.

The earliest tradition which relates to the peopling of Great Britain is to be found in the Welsh Triads.* They tell us that the three good and true tribes of the Island of Britain were the Cymry, who came from the land of Haf, where as some old transcriber has explained, Constantinople now is; the Lloegrians, who came from the land of Gwasgwyn, and were sprung from the primitive stock of the Cymry; and the Britons, who came from the land of Llydaw, and were also sprung from the primordial line of the Cymry. All these tribes spoke the same language, and were of the same blood; and these three tribes

* Printed in the *Myvyrian Archaiology of Wales*, vol. ii. pp. 57-8. See also Davies's *Celtic Researches*, p. 154. In modern Welsh *Gwasgwyn* means Gascony, *Llydaw* Brittany, *Pwyl* Poland, *Gwyddel* Irish; but it is not certain that these words have the same value in the Triads. The Gwyddyl Ffichti are said to have come from the shores of the sea of Llychlyn, which is, in modern Welsh, the name of Norway.

seem to be regarded, in the Triads, as the Britons proper. After them apparently came three other tribes, as it were upon sufferance, and they became possessed of certain lands as a gift, but not as a conquest. These three tribes were the Caledonians, in the North; the Gwyddylians, also in the North; and the Gwyr Galedin, who settled in the Isle of Wight when their country was submerged. The rights and privileges of pure-born Cymry were not to be enjoyed by these new comers until the ninth generation. After these again came three other tribes, who obtained a footing by force—the Coranians, who came from the land of Pwyl; the Gwyddyl Ffichti; and the Saxons.*

It is of course necessary to test the credibility of the Triads, as we tested that of Gildas. The Triads cannot, from the very form in which they are written, claim to be the statements of contemporaries at first hand. It is obvious that some one who lived after the arrival of each triplet of new comers must have thrown three distinct arrivals—each probably separated from the others by a long interval—into the form of a Triad. He could not have been contemporary with more than one of those arrivals, and that the last. It follows therefore that the utmost value

* There is, however, a statement in some Welsh MSS. and in Nennius, that Vortigern *gave* the Isle of Thanet to the Saxons. See Iolo MSS. published by the Welsh MSS. Society. *Oral Traditions and Chronology*, pp. 39 & 415, and *Nennius* ap. *Mon. Hist. Brit.* p. 65.

which we can allow to this portion of the Triads is that of a history founded upon some antecedent authorities, of the nature of which we are in total ignorance. It will therefore perhaps be best to regard these Triads as traditions, which may reasonably be credited only when confirmed by other testimony, or which may be interpreted by the aid of that other testimony. The Triads are found wanting, upon the application of one historical test, Gildas upon the application of another. We have then two independent traditions, that which we find in Gildas and that which we find in the Triads. And we must receive the evidence of both just as a court of justice would receive the evidence of two witnesses whose character would not bear examination. We must compare their statements with the rest of the evidence brought before us, and form our opinion upon the case as a whole.

If we disregard for a moment the difficulty of identifying the different tribes mentioned in the Triads with those tribes which are known to us from other sources, we find a general statement that from the earliest period to which tradition can carry us back, there was a succession of new colonists coming from the continent to Great Britain. We find, moreover, that those who came in the second and third expeditions were most like those who came in the first; that the following three tribes were probably less like, because a certain lapse of time was considered necessary before they could receive the

privileges of true Cymry; and that the last three had still fewer points of resemblance, because their occupation of territory is denounced as a wrongful usurpation.

All this, unlike the story of Gildas, is precisely what we might expect, and is in the main probably true. We know that there has been a pressure of tribe upon tribe from the earliest times to which history can carry us back; and we know that, in Western Europe, the most severe pressure has been that of the Teutonic upon the Celtic tribes. Philology tells us that Celtic names for mountains and rivers are scattered over almost the whole of Europe; and history tells us how hosts of Celts, probably urged on by hosts of Germans in their rear, made their way to Rome and to Delphi, and how in later times the principal enemies of the Roman empire were of the Teutonic race.* By the light of this knowledge it is not very difficult to decipher the descriptions of the Triads. The first comers, after the Cymry, were, in almost all respects Cymry themselves. As time went on, it was found that men speaking a somewhat different language—though a language still probably having many points of resem-

* Though I have frequently found it convenient to use the word *race*, I wish it to be understood that I do not commit myself to any theory about the first origin of the different races of mankind. I simply recognise the fact that there are various peoples possessing common characteristics in which they differ from other peoples, and which they hand down to their descendants with very little change.

blance to that of the Cymry—came from the opposite coasts. And at last there came men speaking a language so different that no kinship with them could be admitted.

So far we may feel tolerably sure of our ground; but what proportion the number of new comers bore to the number of original Cymry, what extent of territory they occupied, and what was the intermixture with the previous inhabitants, neither history nor tradition will tell us.

It would probably be waste of labour to make any attempt at an identification of the different tribes mentioned by Cæsar, Tacitus, and Ptolemy with those mentioned in the Triads; but about one tribe a word or two must be said. The Belgæ occupied the central southern coasts of Britain, and the Belgæ also occupied a considerable portion of northern Gaul. There can be but little doubt that the Belgæ of Britain and the Belgæ of Gaul were of the same race. But we are told by Cæsar that the Belgæ were a German race and came from beyond the Rhine. If this statement be considered trustworthy, we shall be compelled to assign to the introduction of a Germanic element into Britain a very early date; if, on the other hand, we can discover that the Belgæ were not Germans, but Celts, we may be tolerably certain that there was no very considerable admixture of German blood in Britain at the time of the Roman invasion. Such an admixture was to be found among the Belgæ or nowhere—at least nowhere south of the Humber.

But it has been conclusively shown, by Dr. Prichard,* that the Belgæ were Celts. Dr. Latham, in his 'Ethnology of the British Islands,' has adopted the same view, and supported it by some additional evidence. M. Thierry,† too, has gone into the same subject at great length, has tracked the Belgæ in their various wanderings, and has pronounced them to have been originally a warlike confederation of Cymric stock. It is not therefore necessary to attempt again what has already been so thoroughly accomplished; but, as an additional confirmation, it may not be out of place to call attention to the fact that in the kingdom of Wessex a Celtic name crops up among the Saxon kings; and it was in the kingdom of Wessex that the district of the Belgæ was included. It is not very probable that the part of Britain which had been Germanised before the coming of the Saxons would be ruled by a Celtic or half-Celtic king. In whatever light we may look at the circumstance, it is very curious that a king named Cadwalla should lead Saxons to conquer Saxons; but it is doubly curious if we are to consider Wessex as doubly German.

There seems, however, no reason to doubt that the Belgæ were Celts, and that when the Romans first invaded the island they found an almost purely

* *Researches into the Physical History of Mankind*, vol. iii., pp. 70 *et seq.*, 109 *et seq.*, and 123 *et seq.*

† *Histoire des Gaulois:* Introduction, p. l-lxv., and elsewhere.

Celtic* population, all speaking a language which did not probably differ more in different parts of South Britain than the several dialects of English differ from one another at the present day. The population was also probably purely Celtic in the time of Agricola, for, had it been otherwise—had there been any Saxons or Frisians, or Angles, or Jutes in the island—we may be tolerably certain that so great an admirer of the Germans as Tacitus would not have omitted to mention the fact.

The next point, therefore, for our consideration is the influence of the Roman occupation upon the population of Britain. It can hardly be doubted that this occupation had some influence for a time at least; the question for decision is, whether this occupation had any considerable permanent influence.

The proportion of Britons to non-Britons must have been affected in two ways. In the first place, numbers of the natives were draughted into the Roman legions for foreign service; in the second place, there was a Roman army of occupation† quartered in the principal towns of Britain. But it does not appear that this army of occupation amounted at any one time to more than about twenty thousand men‡—a number wholly

* It will subsequently be seen that it is hardly safe to attach any more definite meaning to the word Celtic than non-Teutonic.

† The Roman colonies under the Empire seem to have been little, if any, better.

‡ This calculation is based on the list of troops given in the

insufficient to effect any perceptible change in the general character of the population. The Roman colonists and the Roman soldiers had probably no more effect upon the closely packed population of ancient Britain, than the English colonies and armies in India have had upon the native Indians, or than the French armies and colonies in Algeria have had upon the Arabs. And even this parallel will hardly hold good; for the French in Algeria are for the most part truly French, and the English in India are for the most part truly English, but the Romans in Britain were not truly Romans. The legions which came from Rome to Britain were recruited from almost every country which the Romans knew. There were legions of Germans both High and Low; there were legions of Gauls and of Spaniards; of Sarmatians, of Dalmatians, of Thracians, of Dacians, of Huns, of Cilicians, of Indians, and of Moors. And in all these legions the per-centage of true Romans must necessarily have been small. Italy had not men enough to supply many Italians to all her legions; and the inhabitants of Rome itself were already so

Notitia Utriusque Imperii, which may be consulted in the *Monumenta Historica Britannica*. Mr. Wright, who argues that the Roman occupation completely altered the character of the population, does not estimate the number of Roman soldiers in Britain at more than 20,900—*i.e.* 19,200 infantry, and 1,700 cavalry. And this number seems to include those who were permanently settled as colonists and those who were on active service. See Mr. Wright's *Essay on the Ethnology of South Britain at the Extinction of the Roman Government*, and *The Celt, the Roman, and the Saxon*, p. 358.

deeply plunged in vice and indolence that there remained among them but little of the stuff of which soldiers are made. Even the chief officers of the legions were natives of all parts of the Roman world. A *Præfectus Alæ* or a *Præfectus Cohortis* was not necessarily nor even commonly a Roman by birth. Among those who were in Britain, as Mr. Wright* has shown from inscriptions, were Frisians, Gauls of the tribe of the Senones, Belgians, Mauritanians, natives of Nîmes, of Lyons, and of Fréjus in Gaul, of Rauricum in Switzerland, of Nicomedia in Bithynia, of Tysdrus in Africa, of Mursa in Lower Pannonia, and of Samosata in Syria. Had there been an army of twenty thousand men, all of one race, constantly maintained in Britain, it would hardly have sufficed to tinge the whole of the British population with any of its characteristics; but when that army was made up of recruits from all parts of the world—from Belgium to India, from Sarmatia to Mauritania—it had no characteristics of race to impart.

The laws according to which characteristics are handed down from generation to generation are not yet quite definitely established. On the one hand, we have the principle of atavism, according to which the peculiarity of a remote ancestor appears in his descendants; but, on the other hand, we have the tolerably well ascertained fact that an admixture of blood belonging to a variety of animal different from

* *The Celt, the Roman, and the Saxon*, p. 256.

any given variety will leave hardly any perceptible traces after a few generations. For instance, the offspring of a white and a black is a mulatto, which bears the marks of both races: the offspring of a white and a mulatto is a quadroon, which shows comparatively but little sign of its black ancestry; the offspring of a white and a quadroon is an octoroon, in which it requires a very experienced eye to detect any trace of black blood; and the descendants of the white and the octoroon are to all intents and purposes whites; though perhaps even in some distant generation a resemblance to negro features may betray itself.

If we apply this latter principle of absorption to the inhabitants of Britain at the time of the Roman occupation, we shall see that the descendants of the Britons who intermarried with the Roman colonists might have been, in two or three generations, to all intents and purposes Britons. There was not a sufficient number of colonists to sustain the new elements introduced into the British blood; there would not have been a sufficient number, had all those colonists been of one race. The half-breeds sprung from Roman colonists and British women must, for the most part, have intermarried with Britons, and so on, until the foreign element was eliminated. And it must not be forgotten that even this foreign element was in part akin to the native British element. The Belgic legions, especially, were nearly akin to, and probably spoke a language very

similar to that of, the Britons. It may seem superfluous to insist so strongly on this point, but it is necessary to do so because a question has been raised whether the people who opposed the Saxons were Britons at all.* One of the reasons assigned for this doubt is, that we have no means of ascertaining what was the language of the ancient Britons before the invasion of Cæsar, and therefore cannot tell whether the languages left behind in England, on the departure of the Romans, were related to that language. The argument is not very conclusive, but an attempt will be made, in the next chapter, to show that we are not altogether without any means of ascertaining what was the language of the ancient Britons.

In the meantime, there seems no reason to doubt that for a considerable period after the occupation of Britain by the Romans, the British blood remained very little less pure than it was when the Lloegrians came, if they ever did come, to share the land with the Cymry. Still there had been a slight admixture of German blood, and that is the only admixture which would have any permanent effect, because it is the only admixture which was subsequently renewed.

And a slight increase of that admixture probably occurred even before the Romans abandoned the Britons to their fate. Without supposing that the

* By Mr. Wright. *The Celt, the Roman, and the Saxon*, p. 458.

'Count of the Saxon Coast' was the Count of a Coast actually in the possession of Saxons,* we may be tolerably certain that the Romans had not, in their latter days, power enough to exclude the Saxons from the island. 'At this time,' says Ammianus Marcellinus (and this time is nearly a century before the date assigned to Hengist and Horsa) 'at this time the Picts, and *the Saxons*, and the Scots, and the Attacotti continually harassed the Britons.'† And at this time, too, the Roman power was almost at an end. As the grasp of the Romans relaxed, the Saxons, who had been watching their opportunity, laid their hands upon the land. It is quite as probable that the Romans, when leaving the island, made a virtue of necessity, as that they simply withdrew their legions for use nearer home. The Saxons came in when the Romans were no longer able to keep them out; and, when the Saxons appeared in the south, the Picts appeared in the north. Rome had enough trouble on her hands, and was probably beaten in Britain as she was beaten elsewhere. That

* This is Mr. Kemble's view (suggested in his work on the Saxons in England, p. 14), and he has given good arguments in support of it. But it seems nevertheless almost incredible that the Romans could have allowed other invaders to gain a footing in Britain, while they were still able to hold their own, and could then have accepted their humiliation and appointed a Count for the coast that no longer needed defence. And, on the other hand, a Saxon colony founded by the Romans themselves could hardly occupy a whole district.

† *Ammianus Marcellinus*, lib. xxvi. c. 4, ap. *Monument. Hist. Brit.*, p. lxxiii.

the Britons entreated her for succour is not unlikely; they had two foes to deal with at once, and they probably missed the friendship of the civilised Romans, when pressed on one side by the barbarous Picts, and on the other by the no less barbarous Saxons.

And this hypothesis will explain the alliance between the Britons and the Saxons. The Saxons forced their way in while the Roman and British armies were dealing with the Picts, and remained in the island when the Romans left. As their only chance of driving back the Picts—in their desire to deal with one enemy only at a time—the Britons naturally enough concluded an alliance with the Saxons—not the Saxons beyond the sea, but the Saxons who were already in the island. What the Britons desired was probably not so much assistance from the Saxons, as peace with them.

If we accept this hypothesis, we get rid of many of the difficulties which we find in the story of the Saxon settlement in Britain, as usually told. In the first place, the difficulty which the Britons found in driving back the Picts is fully accounted for; on any other hypothesis it is not so easily explained. In the second place, we discover why the Saxons, of all people in the world, were selected as allies. In the third place, we account in some measure for the confused narrative of Gildas by throwing back the first arrival of the Saxons a hundred years or more. And we may also perhaps account for the arrival of new hordes of Saxons, when the Picts had been

defeated. The Britons, true to their policy of taking their enemies in detail, probably turned their arms against the Saxons, when relieved from the pressure of the Picts. The Saxons immediately called for aid from their Fæderland, and then came the great struggle which ended, as we know, in the prevalence of the Saxon language, if no more, over that part of the island which we now call England. We shall have to consider how much is proved by that fact, in the next chapter; for the present we have to consider only the historical evidence, or that which passes for it.

The testimony of Gildas has already been examined and decided to be, by itself, of no value. When we seek for confirmation, we find none, except so far as relates to the bare fact that there was an invasion of Britain by Germans. Let us now consider for a moment who were the combatants. With the exception of the Coranians, settled on the Humber, who may have been of German or Scandinavian origin, it does not appear that there was before the coming of the Saxons a single non-British tribe in South Britain. But it is tolerably clear that, though the various tribes of Britain were non-Teutonic, they were not always on friendly terms with one another. They might perhaps unite in great emergencies. A considerable number of them apparently did for a time unite against the common enemy, whether Pictish or Saxon; but their jealousy of one another seems to have been as powerful a motive, among them, as their hatred of the foreigner. It might

have been supposed that the long occupation of the Romans, with their centralising influence, would have had some tendency to fuse these different tribes into one; that the network of roads which the Romans laid down would have kept up a constant communication between north and south, east and west; and that the jealousies and feuds of the Britons among themselves would have been forgotten. But it must be remembered that, when the Romans went, the centre of government went with them. There was no common rallying-point for the whole of the Britons; and every man, who had ambition, probably thought it better to be an independent prince, however petty, than the subject of a prince with no higher pretensions than his own. And so the invaders had every facility not only for making conquests but for making alliances.

It is invariably the policy of invaders to seek for allies in the country which they invade. The policy of the Saxons was probably no exception to the rule; and we find, in the Triads, bitter complaints against the treachery of the British princes. And especially, they tell us, the Lloegrians were brought into confederacy with the united Coranians and Saxons. But we must not forget that such alliances as these imply, so long as they last, equality between the allied tribes, some kind of social intercourse, intermarriages. Such must have been the relations between the West Saxons and the Britons, else Cadwalla could never have been king of Wessex.

And the invaders themselves, though all probably of kindred races, differed among themselves just as the Britons differed among themselves. Sometimes they called in the aid of the Britons against each other. The King of Mercia calls in the aid of the Britons to defeat the King of Northumbria; the kingdom of Wessex, whose sovereign at one time bears a Cymric name, gradually fights its way to supremacy over the other Saxon kingdoms; Mercia wages war against Northumbria, East Anglia, Essex, Kent, Wessex—all its neighbours. These petty Saxon kingdoms were, from first to last, employed either in making war upon their neighbours, or in murdering their own sovereigns.

But while the conquerors were thus quarrelling among themselves, what had become of the Britons who had formerly dwelt on the land which the invaders now occupied? The Triads give an answer to this question: 'The Lloegrians became as Saxons.'* There can be but little doubt that this is the true answer; there is evidence to confirm it; and there is no evidence to contradict it, except that of Gildas, which is worthless, and that of language, which will be considered hereafter. And it is satisfactory to find that the strongest confirmatory evidence comes from a Saxon source. We know from the laws of Ine, that there was a British† population dwelling among

* *Myvyrian Archaiology of Wales*, vol. ii. p. 58, Tri. 7.

† These 'Wealhs,' it appears, could possess land and perhaps slaves, but were not on quite equal terms as regards the 'weregild.'

the Saxons, and that its position was not very inferior to the position of the Saxons themselves. But, in addition to these Saxonised British land-owners, there must have been a considerable number of captives belonging to the Lloegrian and other British tribes, all of whom helped to increase the proportion of British as compared with Saxon blood. And still further there must have been a number of Saxo-Britons of the half-blood, some at least of whom would have the full privileges of Saxons.*

The foregoing considerations take from the value of Mr. Taylor's ingenious attempt† to arrive at the per-centage of the Celtic population by reference to the area of the hundreds, and the numbers of slaves, as given in Domesday Book :

'The hundred is supposed to have been originally the settlement of one hundred free families of Saxon colonists, just as the canton was a similar Celtic division. . . . . .

'The manner in which the island was gradually peopled, and the distribution and relative density of the Saxon population, are curiously shown by the

—*Die Gesetze der Angelsachsen von Dr. Reinhold Schmid, Ine's Gesetze.* Ancient Laws and Institutes of England (Public Record Commission) Laws of Ine, 23, 32, 33, &c.

* Mr. Kemble, by a somewhat different process, arrives at a very similar result: 'The mass of the people, accustomed to Roman rule, or the oppression of native princes, probably suffered little by a change of masters, and did little to avoid it.'—*The Saxons in England*, p. 20.

† *Words and Places*, p. 387.

size of the hundreds. In Kent, Sussex, and Dorset, which were among the earliest settlements, the Saxon population was very dense, whereas when we approach the borders of Wales and Cumberland, the hundreds include a much larger area. . . . We arrive at somewhat similar conclusions from the proportions of the slaves to the rest of the population as returned in Domesday. In the East of England we find no slaves returned. In Kent and Sussex they constitute ten per cent. of the population; in Cornwall and Devon twenty per cent.; and in Gloucestershire thirty-three per cent.'

But Sir James Mackintosh has already thrown a very different light on these and similar facts. 'Of the thirty-four counties,' he says,* 'examined by Mr. Turner, four have no persons called slaves; and two of these are the extensive counties of York and Lincoln: while the proportion of slaves to the body of the intermediate class, containing villains, bordars, and cottars, was in Nottingham as one to a hundred and fifty, in Derby as one to a hundred and thirty-nine, in Somerset about one to six, and in Devon nearly one to four. Such an extreme inequality seems to indicate *that this class of men had various names in different counties, or that different sets of commissioners employed in the survey varied from each other in their language.*'

* *History of England*, vol. i. p. 78. The passage to which he refers is in Sharon Turner's *History of England*, vol. iii. pp. 247-260.

The absence, too, of slaves from West Yorkshire and the small numbers found in Nottingham and Derby are opposed to Mr. Taylor's hypothesis that the greater the number of slaves the more Celtic must the population have been, and *vice versâ*. Nor should it be forgotten that Domesday was compiled more than 600 years after the date usually assigned to the landing of Hengist and Horsa; and that the Saxons had, in the meantime, been continually at war with one another, or with the independent Britons, or with the Danes, to whom they ultimately submitted. After so long an interval passed in such a manner, it is impossible to say who were the slaves and who the free. If the Saxons were so hard pressed that their greatest king was compelled to seek shelter in a herdsman's hut, or that such a story could pass current, they were certainly not in a condition to retain a hold upon their British slaves, if at that time they possessed any. At such a crisis the slaves would either be freed and armed, or would join the invaders. That there may have been a considerable proportion of British blood in such slaves is probable, just as it is probable that there was a considerable proportion of British blood among all classes.

It is not to be supposed that the Saxons brought over with them a very large number of women and children. It is true that we do read of whole hordes emigrating and fighting to obtain a settlement in a new country, but not when the sea has to be crossed

in small boats. From the time when the Saxon first set foot in England, until he finally succumbed to the Norman, he was engaged in a constant struggle; and when he sent for succours from his native land, he would send—not for women, of whom he hoped to gain possession by the fortune of war—but for men who could assist him and share the spoil with him. Boats were, in those days, neither so large nor so plentiful that they could be used to bring over women and children when men were wanted. Even in our time the difficulties of transport are not few; what then must they have been at a time when the Saxon conquerors are represented as crossing in three long boats? It is probable that the families of the principal Saxon commanders were brought over when a footing was secured in Britain; the story of Rowena has perhaps so much foundation in fact. But the widows and daughters of the Lloegrians probably soon found their way to the arms of their Saxon conquerors or allies. And then sprang up a race differing somewhat in different districts, but which may perhaps be generally defined as Neo-Britannic. In the north-east there was probably a British race with a certain infusion of Anglian blood; in the south a British race with a certain infusion of Saxon blood. The proportions of Anglian, Saxon, and British blood cannot be even approximately determined by the historical evidence.

Near the eastern and southern coasts the population would probably be more Anglian or Saxon than

inland, because successive incursions would have driven the Britons from the coast, and would have kept up a supply of Anglian or Saxon blood in the hybrid population. But unless we suppose the populousness of the land, which the Angles, and Saxons, and Jutes abandoned, to have been without parallel, it seems impossible that they could have come in such numbers as to constitute a majority of the population.

So far as we know they occupied but a narrow * strip of land lying between the mouth of the Rhine and the Skager Rack, and including no more than Holland, the northern parts of Oldenburg and Hanover, Holstein, Sleswick, and Jutland.

There is a passage in Procopius which tends to establish this hypothesis. He speaks of the Frisians in England just where we might expect him to speak of the Saxons ;† and the Frisians, it appears, occupied but a narrow strip of coast. The description given by Procopius is confused, for he calls Britain Brittia, and describes it as an island lying between Britannia and Thule. Still there can be but little doubt that by

* But probably not quite so narrow as it is now. The sea has beyond all doubt encroached considerably on this district since the fifth century. For a *résumé* of different inundations, see Esquiros' *La Néerlande et la Vie Hollandaise*, vol. i. chap. i. sec. 2.

† The description of Ethelwerd seems to point in the same direction, 'Porro Anglia vetus sita est inter *Saxones* et Giotos, habens oppidum capitale, quod sermone Saxonico Slesuuic nuncupatur, secundum vero Danos Haithaby.'—*Eth.* ap. *Mon. Hist. Brit.*, p. 502. See *Procopius* ap. *Mon. Hist. Brit.* p. lxxxiv.

Brittia he means Britain; and he says the inhabitants were 'Angles and Frisians and Britons.' This is strong confirmation of the opinion held by the late Professor Donaldson,* that between the Saxons and the Frisians there was but little if any difference.

And it is in the highest degree improbable that a primitive population, living far inland, would look forward with much hope to an emigration involving a sea voyage.

If then we suppose that the whole of the inhabitants of that narrow district which appears to have belonged to the Saxons or Frisians, the Angles and the Jutes, emigrated to Britain *en masse*—men, women, and children—it is hardly credible that their number could have been equal to those of the Britons. We know from Roman authors that Britain was very populous even at the time of the Roman invasion, and it is not probable that the island became less so during the Roman occupation. Internal peace and civilisation would fully make up for the loss of men draughted into the legions; and the Romans must have left Britain at least as well peopled as they found her. And if afterwards Britons fought against Britons it is equally true that Angles fought against Saxons, and Saxons against each other. It is probable, however, that the Britons sustained great loss at the hands of the Picts, though not so great as to give the Saxons a superiority in numbers. But, on the other hand, where a Pictish

* *Essay on English Ethnography*, p. 47.

element took the place of a Cymric or Lloegrian element in the population, there was but the substitution of one native British element for another.

Suppose, then, the whole population of the Jutes, the Angles, and the Saxons to have been transported to Britain, and to have waged a war in which no quarter was given, against the British population, the chances are that more Britons survived than immigrants. If the invaders exterminated or nearly exterminated the Britons, they accomplished a most marvellous feat. With inferior numbers, and probably inferior strategy, they extirpated a race always renowned for its valour, and at this time no stranger to the Roman system of military tactics—the most perfect of its day. The Laws of Ine are of themselves sufficient to contradict such a hypothesis; but when direct evidence is scanty, it is well to accumulate all the indirect evidence which can be discovered.

It is true that we occasionally read of towns being taken, and of all the inhabitants, male and female, young and old, being put to the sword. But such atrocities are rare; no people, no matter what their race, are habitually and unnecessarily cruel; and although a wholesale slaughter may sometimes be perpetrated in a moment of exasperation, it is seldom repeated by the same army. The women and the children, at least, are doomed to a different, if not a happier fate. And for this reason it must almost always happen that, after the conquest of any country,

the blood of the original inhabitants will still preponderate. There is no reason to suppose that the result was different in the case of the Saxon conquest.

But while we have no evidence that the towns were even generally captured by the Saxons, or that their inhabitants were put to the sword, we have evidence, as Mr. Wright has ably shown,* that their Roman constitution has been handed down to our own times. Throughout the Saxon and the Norman period the towns seem to have maintained an almost independent existence; and their increasing influence gradually broke down the feudal system until burghers and barons at last united under our present form of government.

There can be but little doubt that the Britons when worsted by the Saxons would flee for refuge, not to the remote wilds of Wales, but to the equally safe stronghold of the nearest town. In that way the city populations, already in the main of British origin, would receive an access of still purer British blood. And on this supposition we may account for many of those differences between the townsmen and the countrymen by which ethnologists have frequently been puzzled. We may account for the darker hair, more oval face, and longer head of the townsman, who displays the type of the majority of Englishmen; and we may account for the lighter hair, shorter face

* *The Celt, the Roman, and the Saxon*, pp. 443–457.

and broader head of the countryman, to whose type a small minority of the population conform.*

It has already been suggested that but few Saxon women and children could have been brought over to England, and if we were even to allow that every adult male Briton was put to the sword, the British women with their children would still probably constitute more than half of the whole population, and many of them would be enslaved and mingle their blood with the Saxons who settled in the rural districts.

As the meagreness, and the doubtful value, of the historical documents relating to this period have already forced us to estimate probabilities, it may not be superfluous to say a word or two upon those cases which form an apparent exception to the rule that the original population survives in a large proportion. In America, in Australia, and in New Zealand, the original population is undoubtedly disappearing. It leaves hardly a trace in the white populations of those countries. And if we see this result in the western hemisphere, why may we not suspect a similar result in the eastern? Simply because the conditions are totally different. The savage native disappears when brought into contact with the civilised invader; the inferior recedes before the superior. But in Europe the difference between the new comers and the natives has never been so

* The evidence for these statements is given in the third chapter of this essay.

great as in the western hemisphere, and the more civilised has frequently been compelled to submit to the less civilised.

The Romans, though they gave a higher civilisation, and sometimes a new language, to the people which they subjugated, seldom effected a great change in their national institutions, and probably never introduced any new element of importance into their race. Tacitus,* it is true, makes Calgacus, in his grand speech to the Northern Britons, accuse the Romans of creating a solitude and calling it peace. But this is obviously intended for nothing more than one of the artifices of eloquence.

The Teutonic and other tribes which overran Italy herself at the extinction of the Roman Empire, left her still Italian—Italian in appearance, in language, and in thought. In spite of the Moorish occupation of Spain, there are still families there whose boast it is that they have not even a taint of Moorish blood. The Franks and other German tribes who forced their way into Gaul soon became Romano-Gallic in their habits, language, and ideas. The Normans, wherever they settled—in France, in England, and elsewhere—can no longer be distinguished from the people in whose country they found a home. It seems that a race is never annihilated by its conquerors, unless it differs far more from them than any European nations differ from one another, or have differed from one another

* *Agric.* ch. 30.

in historical times. There is no reason why this law should not have held good between Britons and Saxons, as it did afterwards between the so-called Saxons and the Normans. The Saxons did not import a civilisation superior, nor even equal, to that which they found; and although the two contending races had many points of difference, they were still perhaps, though remotely, akin.

Moreover, it must not be forgotten that England was not, until long afterwards, Saxonised even in speech so far as those limits which we now find. From the Tweed to the British Channel a line might be drawn on the west of which was, after the Saxon conquest, a powerful British people, of Pictish or Cymric descent, sometimes making incursions on their more Saxon or Anglian neighbours, sometimes suffering incursions in turn, and sometimes strong enough to equip an expedition for service beyond the seas.* History does not afford us any

* Dr. Lingard and M. Thierry have endeavoured to explain away the statement of Jornandes to this effect by suggesting that the expedition came from Armorica. But the words of Jornandes (ap. *Monumenta Historica Brit.*, p. lxxxiii.) imply that the expedition was sent by sea, and there are hints of similar expeditions to be found in Welsh authors. If it be objected that these authors are not to be trusted, it may be worth while to quote the remarks of Dr. Lappenberg (*England under the Anglo-Saxon Kings*, Thorpe's Translation, p. xxvi.) upon 'the very great antiquity of the poems of the bards Aneurin, Taliesin, Llywarch Hen, and Merddyn, some of which may probably be assigned to the sixth century.' And further (p. 102): 'The more measured veneration of the Welsh poets for that prince, who esteem his general, Geraint, more highly than the king himself, and even relate

evidence that this portion of the island ever became really Saxonised otherwise than in speech; and we may reasonably suppose that in the west of Northumberland, in Cumberland, notwithstanding a few Scandinavian raids upon the coast, in the west of Yorkshire, in Lancashire, perhaps even in Cheshire, and Shropshire, in Herefordshire, in Monmouthshire, in the west of Somersetshire, and in Devonshire, a population exists only less purely Celtic than that of Cornwall or of Wales itself.

It seems, then, that all the direct or indirect historical evidence which can be collected, and all the arguments which can be drawn from analogous cases, lead us to the conclusion that, in the part of the island which is now called England, the population was, before the arrival of the Danes, probably more British than Teutonic.

What effect, then, had the Danes upon the population of South Britain? It is as difficult to answer this question as to answer any of those which have preceded it. We cannot even be certain when the Danes made their first descent upon our coasts, nor what limits we are to assign to their settlements. We cannot be certain, though we may suspect, that the Coranian settlement on the Humber was of Danish

that the latter, far from being always victorious, surrendered Hampshire and Somersetshire to the Saxons, may be adduced as no worthless testimony for the historic existence of King Arthur.' But this point is of no great importance.

origin. We can be certain only that the Danes reduced the greatest of the Saxon kings to the direst extremity, that their influence for a short time afterwards seems to have diminished, and that they finally made one of their chieftains king of all England. It is possible to suggest more than one hypothesis which would explain all these facts. An influx of Danes in overwhelming numbers would explain them; an alliance between Danes and discontented Britanno-Saxons would explain them better. All the general arguments which apply to the Saxon invasion apply with equal force to the Danish invasion. It is not probable that the Danes came in very great numbers, because, unless the Danes are to be considered identical with the Norwegians, the territory from which they came lay within very narrow limits; it is probable that they formed alliances with the chieftains whom they found in the island, because that is the policy of all invaders; and this probability becomes a certainty when we read of the repeated treacheries of Edric. But, if we wish to estimate the proportion of Danish blood in the English nation, history will furnish us with no satisfactory data.

But here, as elsewhere, history affords us the means of forming a conjecture. It has already been suggested that, after the Saxon settlement, the nearer the coast, and especially the eastern coast, the more purely Teutonic must the population have been. If so, the most purely Teutonic part of the population

must have suffered most from the Danish inroads. As a rule, whenever the Danes landed, and were resisted, they were resisted not by the more British inhabitants of the inland districts, but by the more Saxon inhabitants of the sea coast. Again and again the Danes came, and fought a battle, and ravaged the country, and extorted a sum of money as the price of their absence.

After every such inroad the proportion of British to Saxon blood was somewhat changed, and in the aggregate the change must have been considerable.

But, on the other hand, it is not probable that a Danish dynasty could have been founded in England had there not been a considerable Danish element in the population. And it must not be forgotten that Ethelred was in reality the last of the Saxon kings, and that even his reign was half Norman or half Danish. He married a Norman princess, who had influence enough to obtain offices of trust for Norman nobles. In his reign the Dano-Norman conquest was already begun. Edmund Ironside, his gallant successor, was powerless even to postpone the impending change of masters in the extreme south of Britain; and with him died the Saxon dynasty. Edward the Confessor and Harold were, it is true, nominally Saxon kings. But Edward was half-Norman by birth, and held his throne, by sufferance, of Godwin, the king-maker of his time, who was married to a Dane, and whose sympathies were probably no less Danish than Saxon; Harold, the son of Godwin,

was half Danish, and had he succeeded in defeating William the Norman, must have depended quite as much on his Danish connexions in the north as on his Saxon connexions in the south, for the safety of his throne. With the reign of Cnut then begins the ascendancy of the Northmen in England—an ascendancy of which they were never deprived.

But before this ascendancy could have been established, there must, as we have seen, have been a considerable diminution of the Saxon element in the population, and also a considerable increase of the Danish element. One effect must certainly have been a substitution of Danish for Saxon blood, and that to no small extent; another effect probably was an increase of the non-British element in Britain. In other words, the Danes who survived and settled, were probably more numerous than the Saxons of the coast whom they killed in battle—possibly not very much more numerous. Very many of the Anglo-Britons of East Anglia and Mercia must also have perished by the sword of the Danes; and wherever an Anglo-Briton was slain, and a Dane took his place, the proportion of non-British blood was increased. We may therefore conclude that England was less British during the Danish ascendancy than before, though probably not very much less British. But we have still no reason to believe that the non-British element was in excess of the British. Historically, we have nothing but the general argument to rely upon, that the original race, as a rule, survives in larger numbers

than the invading race. But it must not be forgotten that, while the most purely Saxon and Anglian population were destroyed in great numbers by the Danes, the more mixed population of the midland districts suffered less, and the pure Britons of the west, with whom the Danes were commonly in alliance, suffered very little, if at all.

The ascendancy of the Northmen assumes a somewhat different aspect after the military occupation of England by William the Conqueror; but the effect of that occupation upon the mass of the population was probably very slight. The army which William brought over did not, according to the most reasonable estimates, exceed 25,000 men of all arms;* and that army was not recruited exclusively from men of any one nationality. The main body consisted of Franco-Normans—men descended partly from the Northmen, partly from the ancient Gauls. The rest were probably Picards, also partly Gallic, Danes, and Frisians, attracted by the hope of more plunder, adventurers from all parts of France, and lastly

* See Sir J. Mackintosh's *History of England* (vol. i. p. 97), to which I am indebted for a reference to Sismondi's *Histoire des Français*, vol. iv. p. 351. The estimate is formed by comparing the number of knights (402) whose names were preserved in Battle Abbey with the number of those who sailed at the time of the fourth Crusade, and by inferring the followers in the former case from the followers in the latter. But my argument will not be materially affected if we accept the more liberal estimates of the chroniclers. They have probably exaggerated, but the Roll of Battle Abbey is not a very good authority. See Mr. Hardy's *Materials, &c.*, vol. ii. p. 2.

Bretons in considerable force under the command of Alan, son of Hoel the count. The men who fought under William were therefore perhaps as nearly related to the ancient Britons as to the Saxons or Danes. It is but reasonable to suppose that those who followed—probably not a great number—were representatives of the same nationalities as those who defeated Harold. The invasion of William, therefore, and his final conquest of England have no important bearing upon our subject. The protracted struggle, and the cruel devastation of the land between the Humber and the Tees, however much they might affect the population considered numerically, would not materially affect its constituent elements.

From the time of the Norman conquest to the present century there has been no important settlement of foreigners in Great Britain. Henry I. settled some Flemings in Pembrokeshire; but neither they, nor the French who sought refuge here after the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, nor the Dutch who may have followed the fortunes of William III., could have had any considerable influence upon the population. But, on the other hand, there has been since the accession of James I. a steady influx of Scots—partly Celtic from the Highlands—partly of mixed blood from the Lowlands—into South Britain; and from Ireland still greater numbers have found their way into all our large towns.

It appears from these considerations that, until very recently, the new blood, infused into the old English stock, has been more Celtic than Teutonic. But, during the present century, Germans have settled—and not in small numbers—in London, in Liverpool, in Manchester, wherever money is to be made. The Irish immigrants, however, outnumber the Germans by more than ten to one.*

There are also in England, as in most other European countries, a few representatives of almost every nation. But, for our present purpose, we may disregard these minor elements, which have no permanent effect upon our race.

* In 1841 there were according to the Census returns 419,256 natives of Ireland in Great Britain, while the whole of the foreigners and British subjects born abroad amounted together to no more than 44,780. In 1851 there were 733,866 natives of Ireland, and only 56,665 foreigners of all descriptions living in Great Britain.

CHAPTER II.

THE PHILOLOGICAL EVIDENCE.

General estimate of the value of Philological Evidence—English not a truly Teutonic language, but hybrid even in its grammatical forms—Evidence of certain elements in modern English—The names of the principal Geographical features—The Names of the minor Geographical features—Evidence of certain peculiarities of English Pronunciation—No real doubt what was the language of the ancient Britons: its resemblance to the language of ancient Gaul—Early prevalence of a High Celtic element in Gaul and Northern Italy—These facts are important because they tend to explain certain difficulties connected with ancient British skulls —Reasons for and against the identification of the words Cimmerii, Cimbri, and Cymry—Attempt to discover an ancient Cymric or High Celtic civilisation with which our modern English civilisation may be compared—Philology points in the direction of Greece —Comparison of words in the Greek and Cymric languages—Importance of this comparison as showing the civilisation of the ancient Britons—Greek and Cymric conform in type, when their type differs from that of other Aryan languages—Coincidence of the philological evidence with the evidence of tradition, and of some fragments of history—The Celtic and Germanic languages—Philological evidence of a Pre-Celtic element in Britain considered —Sense in which the term 'Cymry' is used in this essay.

On popular philology is probably founded, to some extent, the popular prejudice that the English are of Teutonic origin. The English language is the lineal descendant of a Germanic language; therefore the English people are the lineal descendants of a Germanic people. Such is the very simple, and, at first sight, very satisfactory mode of reasoning, with which

our English ears, and our English books, are filled. It is commonly regarded as a self-evident proposition that language must be conclusive evidence of race. Philology is, by many authors, considered almost identical with Ethnology; and the evidence afforded by other sciences is thought worthy of no more than a passing remark. Such an exaggerated estimate of a favourite pursuit must necessarily lead to very erroneous conclusions, and ultimately impair the *prestige* of a science which really is of the highest value.

In a very recent and a very able philological work,* we are told that 'the British people, the inhabitants of Great Britain, are, we know, mainly of Teutonic blood, and they speak one of the Teutonic languages.' Professor Donaldson † laid down the following principles of research: 'Whenever we have to explain how a nation speaking a particular language came to be placed in a particular locality, *we must content ourselves* with the four following criteria: the philological investigation of the language; the prevailing ethnical, geographical, and personal names of the race; the historical traditions, if there are any; and the physical geography of the country.' And M. Thierry, ‡ though he gives a greater prominence to history, expresses very similar sentiments: 'Bien

* *Words and Places*, by the Rev. Isaac Taylor, p. 59.

† In his Essay on English Ethnography (*Cambridge Essays*, 1856) p. 33.

‡ *Histoire des Gaulois*, troisième éd., preface.

jeune encore, l'auteur avait formé le dessein hardi d'introduire l'unité dans ce chaos, au moyen d'une donnée *ethnologique*, en rapport avec la double science de l'histoire et des langues.'

And a host of other writers might be cited, who, if they have not distinctly enunciated the same principles, have tacitly assumed that they are correct, and have put them in practice as a matter of course. But if there is any one conclusion which may be drawn with certainty from history, it is that language cannot, of itself, tell us what are the proportions of the constituent elements in any nation. The ethnologist would act more wisely if he adopted the maxim of the diplomatist, and declared deception to be the first end of language. Not that either the diplomatist or the ethnologist could pursue his career without the aid of language; but each must be constantly on his guard against this dangerous ally.

He who trusts to language, and especially to written language, alone, as an index to race, must be prepared to maintain that the Gallic nation emigrated from the seven Hills of Rome, and that the Franks came with them; that the Romans extirpated the Celts and Iberians of Spain, and that the Goths and Moors spoke nearly the same language as the Romans; that the Negroes of the United States and Jamaica were exported from England when in their infancy; and that the people of Cornwall, who were Celtic a hundred years ago, have been completely metamorphosed without any assignable cause. So would

Philology, if left to herself, interpret phenomena, of which we know, from other sources of information, that the causes are totally different. The Ethiopian cannot change his skin, but he changes his tongue readily enough.

But some very useful principles may be extracted from this chaos of philological deceptions. One great law may be laid down even from these data. Whenever any given people speaks, wholly or in part, a language spoken by any other given people, there has been, at some time, a connection of some kind between those two peoples.

Thus much and no more will a careful induction allow us to assert. We cannot say that the language of the conquerors always prevails; for, if so, we should ourselves speak Norman-French, the French would speak German, and the Germans would speak Latin. We cannot say that the language of the conquered always prevails; for, if so, the French and English would probably speak dialects of a common Celtic language. We cannot say that the prevailing language is that of the race which survives in the greatest numbers; for, if so, there would be hardly a trace of Latin in France or Spain. We cannot say that change of language may not be simply the result of time, geographical contact, and the influence of a metropolis, because we have seen one instance of such a change in Cornwall. It is obvious then, that we cannot, by means of philology alone, solve the more delicate question of the exact pro-

portion which one element, in any population, may bear to another.

Let us now apply these principles to the popular theory of our origin. If language cannot tell us which was the conquered people, and which the conquering, it certainly cannot tell us that any people has been almost or completely extirpated, though it may, in certain cases, lead us to suspect that a people has not been extirpated. It gives us evidence of Anglo-Saxon influence, but no more; it cannot tell us how many Lloegrian men were slain in battle, nor how many Lloegrian women married Saxon men, nor what were the numbers of the Saxon invaders, nor what was the origin of the invaders themselves. On all these questions it leaves us literally in Cimmerian darkness. It tells us only that there have been Anglo-Saxons, and that there have been Celts in England; in that one particular it confirms the story of Gildas, but leaves all the details as obscure as Gildas has left them. Again we must say, the popular theory may be the true theory, but there is as yet no evidence to prove it.

Nor if we regard the English vocabulary alone is there any evidence that even our language is mainly Teutonic. The words in our dictionaries have been counted, and it has been found that not one-third of them can be traced to a Teutonic origin.* But it is commonly believed that all our grammar is Teutonic.

* Max Müller, *Lectures on the Scienccof Language*, p. 76.

The process of reasoning by which that conclusion is arrived at savours somewhat of German metaphysics. It is this: languages can never be mixed in their grammar; the grammar of the English language is partly Teutonic; it must, therefore, be wholly Teutonic. If the fundamental doctrine were true, it would without doubt be true that the English grammar is not mixed. The doctrines of many philosophers would perhaps be true also if the propositions on which they are founded had a basis of truth. It happens unfortunately that the philologists are apt to follow the example of the metaphysicians —to assume their premises and then manipulate their facts.

That must be a strange definition of grammar which is not at variance with the statement that the English grammar is wholly Teutonic. Does the formation of adjectives belong to the province of grammar? It cannot in the opinion of some modern philologists, or, if it does, the termination *-ble*, must, according to them, be of Teutonic origin. How else are we to account for such words as *unspeakable*, *unutterable*, *thinkable*, *knowable*, *loveable*, &c.? All these words appear to be formed by the addition of a Romance adjectival termination to a Teutonic root, while in such words as *useful*, *successful*, &c., the process is reversed.

In the formation of substantives the same phenomenon is to be found. *Furtherance*, *riddance*, *fulfilment*, *wonderment*, *leakage*, *bondage*, are all in-

stances of substantives formed from Teutonic roots by Romance terminations, while the process is reversed in such words as *consciousness*, *obsequiousness*, &c.

Our way of forming our verbs is no more exclusively Teutonic than our way of forming our adjectives or substantives. There are innumerable verbs in the English language formed by the termination *-ize* or *-ise*, the termination which is most commonly used when it is found necessary to coin a new word—as, for instance, *americanise*. The words popularise and civilisation are perhaps as good instances of hybrid grammar as need be wished for. In the former a Greek verbal termination has been added to a Latin adjective; in the latter there is a double cross, firstly of a Latin adjective with a Greek verbal termination, secondly of a Latin substantival termination with a Franco-Latin verb in a Greek form. And yet an army of purists would not suffice to drive this Greco-Latino-Franco-English monster from our language. They could not even call themselves purists without committing self-stultification.

It is, of course, allowable for any philologist to frame a definition of the word grammar which shall include only so much of the construction of a language as may be found convenient for any given purpose. Thus, grammar may be held to apply to the third person singular of the verb, but not to the first person; to the genitive singular, and to the plural of substantives, but not to the marks

which distinguish substantives from other parts of speech; to the comparative and superlative of adjectives, but not to the positive. All this is allowable. It would be allowable for an ethnologist to argue from a number of men of one race, and a number of women of another race, shut up in an island by themselves, and gradually diminishing in numbers, that different races of mankind can never create a hybrid people. If these men and women were in the habit of destroying all or a great number of their children, it would be allowable for him, at his own risk, to suppress the fact. But in order to know the value of his conclusions we must know the conditions of the experiment. In order to know whether grammar may be hybrid or not we must know whether the evidence bears upon grammar considered in all its branches, or upon grammar of which a large portion has been put out of the way.

It is, then, quite possible so to curtail the meaning of the word grammar, that English shall appear to be a language of which the grammar is wholly Teutonic. But this process of excision must be carried farther than has commonly been supposed. It would be difficult, I think, to convince any impartial enquirer that even our ordinary way of forming the plural of substantives is Teutonic. It is true that there is one out of three Anglo-Saxon declensions in which the plural is formed by *as*;* but is this in all

* It is by no means improbable that this form *as* is itself an evidence of intermixture even in the Anglo-Saxon dialects. It is

cases our plural *s*? He must be a most enthusiastic philologist of the Teutonic school who can regard as a mere coincidence the fact that we form the plural of almost all our substantives in precisely the same way in which the plural is formed by the French. What wonderful philologists must have been those Englishmen whom the Normans conquered! They would not, we are to believe, accept the Norman plurals of the Norman words, but they took that form of plural, which, in their own language, most nearly approached the Norman, and applied it to all Norman substantives indiscriminately! They surrendered two Anglo-Saxon declensions on condition that they might be permitted to retain, for future use, one form of plural which no one in after times could distinguish from French. In this respect, truly, the Normans had nothing to complain of. Why is it, too, that in ordinary conversation we never speak of our brethren, but of our brothers? Is this the substitution of one Anglo-Saxon declension for another, or is it the substitution of the French for the Anglo-Saxon form? If it be a law that there can be no mixed

well known that the Low German languages are in their vocabulary more nearly allied to the Celtic languages than is High German, and that Celtic names of places abound in Europe. If, then, there be an intermixture of grammatical forms it is to the Celtic languages that we must look for an explanation. And in Cornish there is this very form *as*, *es*, *ys*, which appears as *at*, &c., in other dialects. In Welsh, too, there is a form *wys* which is however regarded by Zeuss as not strictly a form of the plural but as a *forma collectiva*, e.g. *Lloegrwys*, the Lloegrians, &c.—Zeuss, *Gram. Celt.*, p. 299.

grammar, and a coincidence that French substantives agree with English in the majority of their forms and inflexions, it must be confessed that the coincidence has the appearance of a law in a greater degree than the law itself. But it is not necessary for my present purpose to pursue this subject farther.

What then can Philology tell us of our origin? Are we to discard her altogether, and betake ourselves at once to her sister sciences, or has she any truths which we may win from her by torture or by coaxing? She has, beyond all doubt, many precious secrets, but she is apt to tell her falsehoods with an air of truth, and her truths with an air of falsehood. She will lend her aid joyously to cloak any ethnological absurdity; she shrinks away abashed from the naked truth. She delights to set her lovers by the ears, and exults to see each of them breaking a lance in honour of some charm which she does not possess. She is beautiful, seductive, capricious, generally inaccessible, yet at times she yields to the simplest, the least ingenious admirer. Horace might have addressed his ode to her as appropriately as to Pyrrha:

> Miseri quibus
> Intentata nites!

Let us, then, woo her with caution, suspecting that we may be befooled even at the moment of success.

Enough arguments, it is hoped, have been adduced to show that any attempts to estimate the proportions of different elements of population from the

proportions of words of different origin in any language, must of necessity be futile. It would therefore be waste of time to enter upon any lengthy analysis of our language or of our different dialects, with a view of discovering the proportion of Roman, of British, of Saxon, or of Danish blood in our population. But of one important fact philology will assure us—a fact of which we may feel certain after the application of our most severe test. There exist Cymric words in the English language, and therefore there has been some connection* between the ancestors of the modern English and the ancestors of the modern Cymry. That connection has probably not been one of mere geographical contact, because we know, from the fate of the Cornish language, that it is the tendency of the English language to supplant the Celtic, not of the Celtic to supplant the English. And the prevalence of the Roman language in Gaul and Spain tends to prove that it is the language of the metropolis† which spreads itself, not the dialects of the provinces.

From the existence of a Cymric‡ element in the English language we may then suspect a Cymric element in the English people. The proportion in

* See p. 68.

† It is, however, not improbable that the Church may have had considerable influence in Romanising the languages of France and Spain.

‡ For instances see a paper by the Rev. J. Davies, *On the Races of Lancashire*, published in the *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 1855, p. 211, and Mr. Garnett's *Essays*, pp. 162-4.

which that element exists, language cannot enable us to estimate. In the same way, we may infer from the presence of a Danish element in the language that there is a Danish element in the people; but we cannot conclude, from language alone, what Professor Donaldson has concluded.* We cannot 'deny that the Danes or Normans, though they sat on the throne and ruled in the provinces by the power of the sword, ever introduced such an amount of population into this island as to qualify its language, or oblige us to call the realm of England by the truer name, in that case, of Dane-land or Norman-land.' It is in such assertions as these that Philology shows how treacherous she can be. Language does not tell of any great inundation of Franks into Gaul, and yet they gave their name to the country. But if there is not sufficient evidence for Professor Donaldson's conclusion, there is not sufficient evidence for an opposite conclusion. Language may sometimes enable us to effect a qualitative analysis of population —never a quantitative analysis.

It has been remarked by many philologists that names are fixed most permanently upon the great geographical features of a country—especially upon its rivers and mountains; and there is ample evidence to show that the ghost of a language will linger about its old haunts of hill and stream, long after the people who spoke it have adopted a new tongue or travelled

* *Essay on English Ethnography*, p. 53.

away to a new home. From such traces as these, it has been argued, we can determine who were the aborignes, or first settlers, in any country. It is assumed that because a particular class of names is endowed with great vitality, it is therefore indestructible. But it must be borne in mind that longevity is by no means identical with immortality, and it must be borne in mind also that the evidence will not bear out the theory of immutability even in historical times.

In North America there is a very considerable proportion of European names given to rivers and to mountains. We find, it is true, the two great rivers Missouri and Mississippi with Indian names, but we find the St. Lawrence, the river Montreal, the James river, the York river, the Colorado, the Sacramento, the Columbia, and nearly all the rivers of Mexico, bearing names of European origin. There are river names signifying in English almost every colour. Among the principal mountains are the Rocky Mountains, the Coast Range, and the Blue Ridge—all bearing English names. Here is ample proof that geographical names cannot tell us with certainty who were the 'autochthones' of any country. But here is also evidence that these names tell us, if not who were the autochthones, at least what has been at some time the ruling people. With these negative and positive principles to guide us, we may perhaps arrive at some definite conclusion respecting the ancient population of Britain.

It is unnecessary to adduce, in this place, any

evidence to prove that the names of nearly all the principal geographical features of England belong to the Celtic languages ; a large proportion to the High * Celtic or Cymric tongue. This proposition has been placed beyond all doubt by a succession of philologists, from Edward Lhuyd downwards.† To give the proofs, would be simply to copy them, to give the reader a *réchauffé* of that which every philologist has seen reproduced again and again. Let us rather consider the import of the fact—not forgetting, however, to remark the exceptions.

And to begin with the exceptions first. 'By far the greater number of Celtic names in England are of the Cymric type. Yet there is a thin stream of Gadhelic names which extends across the island from the Thames to the Mersey, as if to indicate the route by which the Gaels passed across to Ireland, impelled probably by the succeeding hosts of Cymric invaders. The Cymry held the Lowlands of Scotland as far as

* The expressions 'High Celtic' and 'Low Celtic' are used in this essay not to imply any theory respecting the origin of different nations or languages, but simply as general terms—the former embracing the Cymric, Cornish, Armorican and any ancient languages which may have resembled them—the latter, the Erse, Gaelic, Manx, and any ancient languages which may have resembled them.

† But see especially Edward Lhuyd's *Archæologia Britannica*, M. Thierry's introduction to his *Histoire des Gaulois*, Mr. Garnett's *Essay on the Languages and Dialects of the British Islands*, Dr. Prichard's works, Professor Donaldson's *Essay on English Ethnography*, Dr. Latham's *Ethnology of the British Islands*, and the Rev. Isaac Taylor's *Words and Places*.

the Perthshire hills. The names in the valleys of the Clyde and the Forth are Cymric not Gaelic.'*

But this does not tell us quite the whole truth. The low Celtic or Erse *uisge* (water) is, as Mr. Taylor has also remarked, to be found scattered all over England, from the Ouse in Yorkshire to the Exe in Devonshire. If we are to accept the hypothesis that the Gael occupied any portion of the island before the Cymry, we must also accept the hypothesis that they occupied the whole island, not necessarily at one and the same time, but every portion at some time or other. And this is perhaps the hypothesis which most satisfactorily harmonises all the facts. The presence of what we are accustomed to regard as the low Celtic element in widely distant parts of England excludes the theory that there may have been some particular dialect of high Cymric possessing the word *uisge*, which the other dialects wanted. And it is by no means probable that a primitive people, so widely diffused as the Celts who inhabited Britain, would, *if of pure blood*, have had in constant use over the whole area three distinct synonyms for water or river—*dwr*, *afon*, and *uisge*. An inspection of the modern languages, with the history of which we have some acquaintance, leads rather to the conclusion that synonyms are generally the result of an intermixture of languages.

Nor, on the other hand, does there seem to be any

* *Words and Places*, p. 257.

support for the theory that the arrival of the Gael was posterior to that of the Cymry. The relative geographical position of the Gael and the Cymry, and the knowledge which we possess of the migration of tribes on the continent, all lead us to the opposite conclusion—the conclusion of Edward Lhuyd—that the Gael preceded the Cymry and were conquered by them. The question whether the Gael were themselves an unmixed race it will be more convenient to glance at in another chapter.

Meanwhile, let us suppose a nation known by the name of Gael—not necessarily of pure blood—to be overcome by successive hordes of High Celts; what will be the result upon the population? The same principles which were applied to the invasion of Cymric Britain by the Saxons must be applied to the invasion of Gaelic Britain by the Cymry, Lloegrians, &c. The result must of course depend in great measure upon the relative numbers of natives and invaders, and upon this point we can have very little, if any, evidence.

The Triads tell us that the three first High Celtic tribes took peaceable possession of the land, and inflicted no injustice on any one. This tradition, if it is to be trusted, would imply that very little resistance was made to the Cymry; and perhaps we may infer that the native population was very small. If so, the constant succession of tribes poured in upon the shores of Britain, would possibly leave the Gael in a minority, and the predominant blood

would be that of the High Celts; and this would inevitably be the case if, as there is reason to suspect, the Gael themselves were partly of Cymric blood. The British people would in this case be, at the time of the Roman invasion, of a decidedly High Celtic type, though not without some admixture of Low Celtic blood.

We have hitherto considered language only in two of its aspects—that which it presents in the names of the great geographical features of a country, and that which it presents in speech and in written documents. There is a third aspect which must not be forgotten, though it will not enable us to effect a quantitative analysis any more than the others. The names of towns, and of the minor geographical features stand in an intermediate position between every-day speech and the names of the greater geographical features. They seem to change less rapidly than the former, but more rapidly than the latter. In America the names of towns and of the minor geographical divisions are almost exclusively European. Yet even in America Indian names are borne by towns and districts where Indian blood is no longer to be detected; and a numerous Negro population would, if annihilated, leave not a trace behind it in the geographical names of the United States. In India, on the other hand, the English conquerors have scarcely made a scratch upon the map of the country. The names

not only of mountains and of rivers, but of districts, of towns, and of villages, are almost without exception Indian. If the English were to be expelled in the nineteenth century, and some philologist of the forty-ninth century were to write a dissertation upon the influence of various nations in India, he would have—from philology alone—not the slightest evidence that the English had ever held the country. And this is the more remarkable when it is remembered that many of the high caste Indians speak English as purely and as well as Englishmen of the highest education. All these instances tend to prove that the absence of any philological element in a language will not prove the absence of the corresponding element of population; nor, if we are to judge from America, can we even assert that the presence of a certain philological element, in the names of places only, will prove the existence of the corresponding element in the population.

But the results of a computation made by Mr. Isaac Taylor are so curious that we should not be justified in passing them over without special notice. 'Over the whole land,' he tells us,* 'almost every river-name is Celtic, most of the shire-names contain Celtic roots, and a fair sprinkling of names of hills, valleys, and fortresses, bears witness that the Celt was the aboriginal possessor of the soil.' He then subjoins

* *Words and Places*, p. 256.

the following table, from which river-names are excluded:—

Per-centage of Names from the	Suffolk.	Surrey.	Devon.	Corn-wall.	Mon-mouth.	Isle of Man.	Ireland.
Celtic . . .	2	8	32	80	76	59	80
Anglo-Saxon .	90	91	65	20	24	20	10
Norse . . .	8	1	3	0	0	21	1

The results here presented agree so well with what we are told of the successive invasions of Teutons that there is some temptation to make an estimate from them of the proportions of Celtic and Teutonic blood in different parts of the country. But it must be remembered that there may be more than one cause for the difference discovered in different counties. One cause may well be a greater proportion of Anglo-Saxon blood in the eastern counties.* Another cause is probably the different length of time during which the influence of the Anglo-Saxon language has extended over the different districts. The influence in the extreme east dates probably from the time when the Romans evacuated Britain. The full influence in the extreme west dates probably from the conquest of Wales more than eight hundred years afterwards. But, be the causes what they may, the evidence which we have from other countries is sufficient to put us on our guard against the supposition that a per-centage of words must necessarily indicate a per-centage of blood. There

* For arguments pointing in that direction see pp. 50, 59, 60.

is philological evidence to show that Celtic blood is diffused over the country; but there cannot be any philological evidence to establish the proportion in which it is diffused. And, for the reasons already given, we cannot allow that the able and elaborate analysis of the Lancashire dialect, made by Mr. John Davies, can be considered equivalent to an analysis of its races. In that county, he tells us,* the population 'is chiefly of Anglian blood, with a considerable mixture of Saxon and Scandinavian, and blended, probably in an equal degree, with that of the Cambrian race.' From other considerations it seems probable that he has under-estimated the proportion of Celtic blood.

The foregoing remarks may perhaps be considered somewhat discouraging to ethnologists, if not discourteous to philologists. But philology is in itself a charming study, apart from any ethnological conclusions to which it may lead; and, in spite of all the difficulties which attend it, it will lead to some satisfactory ethnological conclusions, especially when aided by other sciences.

For instance, if the pronunciation of the English language be attended to, as well as the mere words, it will be found that an Englishman scarcely ever utters a sentence without introducing sounds for which he is indebted to the Cymric language and

* *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 1855, p. 282.

probably the Cymric language alone. The English *th*, which represents both the Cymric *th* and the Cymric *dd* or *dh*, is to be found neither in the Danish nor in any of the Teutonic languages* spoken in the countries from which our ancestors are supposed to have come. It may perhaps be asserted that these sounds did exist in the Anglo-Saxon dialects,† but such an assertion can be asser-

* It exists, according to Rask (*Grammar of the Anglo-Saxon Tongue*) and other authorities, in Icelandic. The tradition runs that Iceland was peopled from Norway in the ninth century. But it must be remembered that in almost every country the inhabitants are apt to boast that their ancestors were the first possessors of the soil; and another legend tells that the Norwegians were preceded by some Irish monks. But even if we allow that the Norwegian colonists carried the *th* sound with them into Iceland and England, we shall but have one more link in the chain of evidence that the inhabitants of Scandinavia were of the Cymric family before they become Teutonised. It is tolerably well known that the sound is not met with in Dutch, High German, or Danish; and to show that it does not exist in the languages spoken between the Rhine and the Elbe, I quote from Bendsen's *Nordfriesische Sprache*: — 'Einzelne Abweichungen in der Rechtschreibung habe ich nicht immer vermeiden können; doch sind sie nirgends von der Art dass die richtige Aussprache in Wesentlichen darunter litte. So ist es z.B. für die Aussprache ziemlich gleichgültig ob man Täte, Thäte, oder Tähte—Vater, in der Anrede—schreibt, da jedes dieser Wörter doch immer so lauten wird, wie das deutsche thäte, von thun.' Pref. p. xxvi.

† If they did, the Saxons, Jutes, &c., probably adopted them from the Cymry of the Chersonese with whom they may have been intermixed, but there is some evidence that the Cymric *dd* has at least encroached upon a simple *d* introduced by the Teutonic invaders. The rural population, who are probably more Teutonic than the town population, commonly say far*d*en for far*th*ing, fur*d*er for fur*th*er; and the sailors of the Yorkshire coast will tell you that the sea is so many fa*d*oms deep.

tion only. The pure ancient Anglo-Saxons are not alive to speak to us; and the existence of letters or symbols can never prove the existence of sounds. There is quite as much evidence for the existence of the English pronunciation of *th* in modern High German, as in any ancient Teutonic dialect. In German the letters exist, but not the sounds; and it very rarely happens that a German or Dutchman succeeds in giving utterance to them. Both those sounds, however, exist in the modern Greek language; and that fact, considered in combination with others pointing in the same direction, has suggested an argument which is of some importance in this essay.

It may be remarked, too, that, among the lower classes of English, it is not uncommon to hear the letters *sh* pronounced as *s*, as for instance in the words *shrub*, *shrimp*, &c., which are converted into *srub*, *srimp*, &c. This is a very significant fact when it is remembered that the sound *sh* hardly exists in the Welsh language, except in words borrowed from the English. Among Germans the tendency is in the opposite direction. They constantly pronounce the letter *s* as *sch*, e. g., *schtein* for *stein*, &c.

M. Edwards, who has not, however, entered into details, has remarked* with his usual acuteness and brilliancy: 'If there is one characteristic which distinguishes English from the other modern lan-

* *Des Caractères Physiologiques des Races Humaines*, pp. 102–3.

guages of Europe, it is the extreme irregularity of its pronunciation. In other languages, when one can pronounce the fundamental sounds, one may succeed by the aid of some rules in pronouncing any word pretty correctly, even without understanding it. In English one cannot pronounce until one knows the language.

'Mezzofante, in speaking to me of the Welsh language, traced to it the origin of this peculiar characteristic of the English language. I had no need to ask him *par quelle filière*. I knew, as well as himself, that the English could not have borrowed it from the Welsh, and that the Britons spoke the same language before the invasion of the Saxons. And so he gave me, of his own accord, a new proof unsought for by me, and quite independent of those arguments which had already convinced me, that the Britons had not ceased to exist in England—in spite of the invasion of the Saxons.

'It was supposed that the Britons had been extinct for ages, but Mezzofante, so to speak, recognised their descendants by the sound of the voice; I have recognised them by their features: what then is wanting to prove their identity?'

To say that it is easier to remember the vocabulary of any language than to acquire its pronunciation and accent, is but a truism. A German almost invariably speaks English with a German accent, a Frenchman with a French accent, and each with not a little of his own native pronunciation. The English

speak, with a strongly-marked Cymric pronunciation of many words, a language derived principally from Romance and Teutonic sources. This fact is worth quite as much, in a general estimate of the evidence, as the fact that the Anglo-Saxon language has contributed its share to the grammatical formation of the English language. But the evidence of physical and psychical characteristics is so direct and so conclusive, that it would be waste of time to insist more strongly on that portion of the philological evidence which is derived from pronunciation. By the latter, indeed, is confirmed the evidence which declares mere words and grammatical forms to be of little value in determining the descent of any people; by it, indeed is suggested a conclusion totally at variance with the conclusion suggested by those words and grammatical forms.* Let other evidence decide the

* And most of the grammatical forms characteristic of the Teutonic languages have disappeared from the English, while one Cymric termination at least has supplanted its Teutonic equivalent. A masculine substantive is in English commonly converted into a feminine by the addition of *ess* (e.g. lion, lioness, tiger, tigress), or by the substitution of *ess* for the masculine *er* (e. g. sorcerer, sorceress, &c.). The feminine is also formed in Cymric by the addition of *es*. And we may trace the Cymric influence in some English words in which the Cymric *es* has been added to an already feminine Anglo-Saxon word. Thus in Anglo-Saxon *Sangere* is a singer, and *sangestre* a songstress, *seamere* a tailor, and *seamestre* a seamstress. In these instances words already feminine in Anglo-Saxon are made doubly feminine in English. These are examples in a new form of that kind of reduplication which appears in such expressions as *River Avon*, *Hampton Wick*, &c. Words or suffixes of equivalent signification in different dialects or languages are added together to make a new word in a new dialect.

question; but let it be borne in mind that, so far as the investigation has hitherto gone, both the historical and the philological evidence have failed to show that the English are mainly descended from the Anglo-Saxons.

But we cannot yet put an end to the philological enquiry. Philology, always suggestive, is sometimes able to furnish positive evidence which will establish a particular point; she sometimes furnishes the only evidence which in any way bears upon that point. It has, for instance, been asserted* that we know too little of the language of the Britons before Cæsar's invasion to found any certain argument upon it. Fortunately, this is not quite correct: philology will tell us with tolerable exactness what was the character of the British language at that time, and even what was its relation to the language of the Gauls. The mere fact that the names of our mountains, rivers, and towns are still significant in Cymric, the *pens*, the *abers*, and the *avons* scattered over the country are of themselves enough to tell us what was the language of the Ancient Britons. The names of the British commanders—as Caradoc, Caswallan or Catwallawn, and Cynfelyn, all mentioned by Roman authors—would not have a foreign sound even in the ears of a modern Welshman. The name of Armorica suffices to tell us that a Celtic dialect was spoken in

* In Mr. Wright's *The Celt, the Roman, and the Saxon*, p. 458.

some parts at least of Gaul. It is no mere philological conjecture that in the word Armorica are to be traced the Gallic equivalents of the Cymric words *ar môr* (on the sea). Cæsar tells us* that *all* those states which border on the sea were by the Gauls called 'Armoricæ' as a matter of course. So, too, we know that *petorritum* was Gallic for a four-wheeled carriage. In Welsh *pedwar* means four, and *rhod* a wheel, while the Gaelic or Erse form would be very different. It should also be remarked that as the Latin language approaches the Low rather than the High Celtic languages in the forms in which common roots appear, a word of the High Celtic type when handed down to us by Roman writers is free from all suspicion of a Latin taint. And the evidence does not stop short here. There are many words in Cymric which will account for the modern French pronunciation of Latin words, and show how closely allied the British and Gallic languages must have been.

The following table will illustrate this fact, and the fact that even those words which were adopted directly from the Latin on either side the Channel underwent very similar variations. The pronunciation both of Welsh † and of French must be borne in mind.

* *De Bello Gallico*, vii. 75.

† This and other passages may perhaps be made more intelligible to the general reader by a brief statement of the differences between Welsh and English pronunciation. In Welsh, *c* is invariably pronounced as *k*; *ch* as the German ch in *auch*; *dd* as *th* in *this*; *f* as *v*; *ff* as *f*; *g* always hard as in *gate*; *th* as *th* in *thing*; *u*

LATIN.	WELSH.	FRENCH.
ecclesia	eglwys	église
Deus	Duw	Dieu
caballus	ceffyl	cheval
soror	chwaer	sœur
taurus	tarw	taureau
fruges	ffrwyth	fruit
capra	gafr	chèvre
pondus	pwys	poids
magnitudo	maint	maint
trans	tra	très
sapo	sebon	savon
pons	pont	pont
lac	llaeth	lait
liber	llyfr	livre
mensis	mis	mois
octo	wyth	huit
serum	hwyr	soir

There are also some very curious coincidences in modes of expression, which are perhaps more significant than any identity of individual words, because we may trace in these expressions a certain psychical connection between the different peoples. The compound Welsh numerals are constructed in precisely the same manner as the French, though the

as the French *u* or German *ü*, and when circumflexed as the English *ee*; *w* as the English *oo*; *y* as the English *u* in *sun*, except in the last syllable of a word, when it becomes equivalent to the English *i* as in *win*. The Welsh *ll* is an aspirated *l* which has no equivalent in English but which approaches *thl* perhaps more nearly than any other sound. Welsh names which are now written with the *ll* are in early English records frequently written with *thl*. The vowels *a*, *e*, *i*, *o*, do not vary from the English pronunciation heard in such words as *man*, *den*, *din*, *not*; but when circumflexed both *a* and *e* become like the English *a* in *bane*; *i* and *y* like the English *ee*, and *o* like the English *o* in *bone*.

actual combinations are in some cases different. Both Welsh and French multiply or add together the smaller numbers, ten, and its multiples, apparently without any regular system. The Teutonic languages* (though they exhibit a little irregularity in the formation of the words for 11 and 12) add to 10, up to 19, multiply it for 20, add to the multiple up to 29, multiply again for 30, and so on up to a hundred. The Welsh numerals from 16 to 19 are more remarkable for their irregularity than any of the French. For instance, 16 (un ar bymtheg) is 15+1, and so on up to 19 (pedwar ar bymtheg) which is 15+4, but 18 is sometimes expressed as 9×2 (deunaw); 30 (deg ar hugain) is 20+10; 40 (deugain, or dau ugain) is 20×2; 50 (deg a deugain) is $(20 \times 2)+10$; 60 (trigain, or triugain) is 20×3; 70 (deg a thrigain) is $(20 \times 3)+10$; 80 (pedwar ugain) is 20×4; 90 (deg a phedwar ugain, or pedwar ugain a deg) is $(20 \times 4)+10$. The French numerals from 70 to 99 are similarly constructed, as e.g. soixante dix, soixante onze, &c. (70, 71, &c.) i.e. 60+10, 60+11, &c., up to 80, which is, as in Welsh, 20×4 or quatrevingt, and again up to 90, which is, as in Welsh, $(20 \times 4)+10$ or quatrevingt-dix. This irregularity may be traced to a High rather than a Low Celtic source. The Gaelic numerals exhibit the two forms 10×8 and 20×4 for 80, and the two forms 10×9 and

* From which however must be excepted the Scandinavian; the Danish for 40 is 20×2, and the Icelandic for 80 is 20×4. It will be seen hereafter that there are other traces of Cymric influence in the neighbourhood of the Cimbrian Chersonese.

$(20 \times 4) + 10$ for 90, but do not otherwise differ in their principles of formation from the Teutonic numerals.

Other peculiarities show very curiously the influence of the non-Teutonic mind upon German words. For a fortnight the French say *quinze jours* (fifteen days), the Welsh *pymthegnôs* (fifteen nights), the Germans *vierzehn Tage* (fourteen days); both English and French stand midway between Welsh and German; the English take the German view of the number, and the Welsh view of light and darkness; the French take the Welsh view of the number, and the German view of light and darkness. Precisely the same phenomenon may be remarked in the English se'nnight,† the Welsh *wythnôs* (eight nights), and the French *huit jours* (eight days).

* As in Gaelic so perhaps in English a trace of Cymric influence may be detected in the expression 'fourscore and ten.' Zeuss supposes that the Cymric language once possessed forms analogous to those found in the Low Celtic languages. But, if so, my argument still remains intact. The Cymric language has diverged from a pre-existent form in precisely the same way in which French has diverged from Latin.

† The English *se'nnight*, I am aware, is the descendant of the Anglo-Saxon *seofon-niht*; but inasmuch as we have no Anglo-Saxon writings which are contemporaneous with the Anglo-Saxon invasion we cannot be certain that the habit of reckoning by nights was not contracted in Britain. Tacitus, it is true, says the Germans reckoned by nights and not by days; but I doubt whether his testimony is worth much on this point, and suspect that in this and some other instances he confused the Germans with the Gauls. I have been unable to trace this custom of reckoning by nights in any of the Germanic dialects, except the Anglo-Saxon. But in Gothic I find a trace of the

It will be remarked in the table above given, that where the French differs from the Welsh, it approaches the Latin more nearly than the Welsh approaches it, as e.g. in the words *sœur* and *soir*, which have retained the Low Celtic sibilant as distinguished from the High Celtic guttural aspirate. And of this fact there may be two explanations; either the language spoken by the Gauls, was less High Celtic than the language spoken by the Britons, or the longer occupation of Gaul by the Romans destroyed the national pronunciation.* It is true, as M. Thierry remarks, that the greater part of the words which the ancients have handed down as Gaulish, approach the Gaelic forms more nearly than the Cymric. But it must be remembered that most of those words have come to us from a Latin source, and that the Latin language itself agrees with the Low Celtic or Gaelic. A Cymric word would therefore, where possible, be more or less Gaelised by a Roman. There are remarkable instances of this, in the change of the British Wyth into the Latin Vectis, in the name of the Isle of Wight and of the British Hafren into the Latin Sabrina.† A

non-German view of number. The Goths called a week eight days. It is worthy of remark that the Low German dialects which in their vocabulary approach more nearly than High German to the Celtic dialects, approach them more nearly also in the evidence which they give us of the ancient manner of computing time.

* Professor Donaldson has shown (*Varronianus*, p. 440 *et seq.*) that French more nearly represents Latin, as spoken, than any other modern language—Italian not excepted.

† Zeuss and other philologists suppose that the genius of the

Roman like a Gael would convert *h* into *s*, *p* into *qu*, *c*, or *k*.

If we suppose that the High Celtic element overcame the Low Celtic element in Gaul, and that a fusion of the two languages was effected in that country, we can explain all the phenomena. The Gallic language was somewhat more Gaelic than the British, and would, by a Roman, be still more Gaelised. But even in the Gallic nation there was, in historical times, at least, a considerable infusion of the High Celtic element, owing to the pressure of successive tribes upon the earlier inhabitants. This was especially the case in Northern Gaul, the resting-place of the conquering Belgæ, among whose descendants M. Edwards and Dr. Broca † have discovered the

Cymric language has changed since the time of the Romans—that the Britons themselves said Safren, not Hafren, and used the sibilant wherever it appears in the Low Celtic languages. Zeuss, I suspect, has adopted this opinion because he has written a monograph on the Celtic languages and has not attached sufficient importance to the fact that the Cymric language agrees uniformly with the Greek and differs from the Erse. If the Britons used the sibilant because the Romans used it, the Romans, it might with equal justice be argued, pronounced *t* as *s* because the Germans converted *strata* into *Strasze*. Some philologist of the future will discover the remains of the English language in a French book written on the phonetic system and will argue on the same principle that we could not pronounce the *th* sounds as we do pronounce them, but converted them into *z* and *s*—that we said *ze sing* for *the thing*.

* See for this law Prichard's *Eastern Origin of the Celtic Nations* (Ed. Latham), p. 176, and Donaldson's *New Cratylus*, p. 141.

† Edwards, *Des Caract. Phys. des Races Humaines*, and Broca,

Cymric form of head and size of frame. Our Gallic immigrants, who would come in the greatest numbers from the north of Gaul, probably differed not very considerably from the Britons of their time, would readily amalgamate with the tribes which they found in possession, and would not materially affect their character.

There is reason to suppose that the High Celtic element penetrated not only into Gaul, but into upper Italy at a very early period. Northern Italy was called by the Romans Gallia Cisalpina, and M. Thierry has called attention to the following tradition:* 'Some Celts subjugated Spain about the sixteenth century before our era; some Gauls, calling themselves Ambra or Umbrians, descended into Italy about two centuries later, and the Roman archæologists designated these ancestors of the Umbrian people by the name of ancient Gauls.' 'If now we consult the Umbrian language with a view of disco-

Recherches sur l'Ethnologie de la France, Mémoire lu à la Société d'Anthropologie de la France, le 21 Juillet 1859. Dr. Broca has established the stature beyond all question by the official lists of exemptions from military service. He has shown, too, that the greater height of the Northern Frenchmen is not the result of Teutonic admixture, and has pointed out that the less the infusion of German blood among the Cymry the greater is their height. —P. 43, *et seq.*

* *Histoire des Gaulois*, Introduction, p. xxxix. He refers to M. Antonius Gnipho ap. Serv. Comm. Æn. xii. 753, Bocchus ap. Solin, p. 28, Isidor. Etymol. ix. 2, 87. These authorities must of course be taken for what they are worth. They have all copied nearly verbatim the statement of some previous writer, and are not independent witnesses.

vering whether it approaches more nearly the Gaelic or the Cymric type,* we find, scanty though the evidence may be, that Umbrian differs from Latin in precisely the same manner in which Cymric and Greek differ from Latin. The Latin *qu* becomes, in Umbrian, as in Welsh and Greek, *p:* e. g. Latin *quatuor*, Umbrian *petur*, Welsh *pedwar*. The Welsh *uch*, *uchel*, appears as the Umbrian *ucar*, the Greek ἄκρος; the Welsh *hwra* as the Umbrian *hri*, the Greek αἱρέω; the Greek ἀλφός appears in the Umbrian *alfu*, while the Latin is *albus*. On the importance of the connection between Greek and Cymric we shall have occasion to insist hereafter. To prove that a word approaches more nearly to Greek than to Latin, is generally equivalent to proving that it approaches the High rather than the Low Celtic type. To prove that a word approaches Latin more nearly than Greek, is generally equivalent to proving that it approaches the Low rather than the High Celtic type.†

The Umbrians, then, and, it may be added, for similar reasons, the Oscans, appear to have spoken—if they spoke a Celtic dialect at all—a High rather than a Low Celtic dialect. If we assume that the Umbrians came from Gaul, we have some evidence

* See Donaldson, *Varronianus*, p. 98, *et seq.*

† See Donaldson's *Essay on English Ethnography*, p. 37, for a list (quoted from professor Newman) of Gaelic words closely resembling Latin. Reference will be made to other authors and independent evidence will be given for the general rule hereafter.

that a High Celtic element prevailed in that country at a very early period; if, on the other hand, we suppose, as we may, perhaps, with greater safety, that these Umbrian Gauls came from the east or north, and were distant relatives of the inhabitants of Gallia, known by a common national name, we still have evidence that languages of the High Celtic type were on their march at a very early period. They probably found their way across the Rhine at least as early as across the Alps, and kept continually increasing the proportion of the High Celtic element in northern Gaul, and along the shores of the German Ocean, until the last tribe or confederation—the Belgæ—left all the lands east of the Rhine to the non-Celtic nations.

If now we suppose that the Gael* settled in Britain before the Cymry, that the Cymry came from the north of Europe, and had very little, if any, admixture of Gaelic blood before they arrived, and lastly that the tribes who followed the Cymry were partly or even principally Belgæ from northern Gaul, we shall account for the slight divergence from the ideal High Celtic language which we find in Cymric;† we shall account for certain chronological difficulties which affect the evidence from British skulls; and we shall account for the Gaelic form of some ancient

* Themselves probably a mixed and partly Cymric people, if we may judge from the human remains found in Britain and France.

† As for instance in the word *seth* or *saith*, in which we should rather expect to find an initial aspirate as in the Greek ἑπτά.

Gaulish words transmitted to us by the Romans. We need not, therefore, suppose that the Gaulish approached the Gaelic language more nearly than it approached the Cymric, for the evidence is against such a supposition; but we may suspect that it approached the Gaelic more nearly than the Cymric approaches it. The language of Gaul was probably the language of a conquering tribe, inferior in numbers to the conquered; it was therefore probably more corrupt than the dialect of the same language spoken in Britain. In Britain it is probable that there was a far larger proportion of Cymric blood, and that the Cymric type both of feature* and of language prevailed.

Our field of enquiry has already been extended far beyond the shores of Britain, and it must now be extended farther still. It may be thought that after what has been said of the value of philological evidence it is useless to seek abroad for that which cannot be found at home. Such evidence may be vague and worthless when considered by itself, but yet not without value when considered in conjunction with testimony of another kind.

There is one kind of philological evidence which we have not yet taken into consideration. An attempt has been made to estimate the value of evidence derived from every-day speech, and from the names of places; but the evidence which presents

* This point will be considered in the next chapter.

itself in the names of large tribes or nations has been purposely left to the last. It is evidence which may establish a connection of some kind between nations now widely separated, but possibly possessing some common element or elements. If such a connection as this can be established between the ancient Britons and any other nation of antiquity, some indirect evidence may be obtained by a comparison of the physical and mental characteristics of the ancient Britons with those of the nation supposed to be akin to them, and by a subsequent comparison of those characteristics, as observed in that kindred nation, with the characteristics of the modern English. Philology is often useful as a signpost, where it has no pretensions to the character of a road.

There can be no doubt that to write the words Cymry, Cimmerii, and Cimbri, is to play with edged tools. Many philologists and historians have assumed the identity of those names as a matter beyond all doubt; many have looked on the idea of such an identity as too absurd to be worth investigation. The only author, so far as I am aware, who has thoroughly considered the question, is M. Amédée Thierry. In his *Histoire des Gaulois* there are arguments advanced which I think it is impossible to explain away without rejecting philology altogether. It has, I am aware, been supposed that Zeuss has in his *Grammatica Celtica* entirely destroyed the link between Cimmerii and Cymry by suggesting a not improbable derivation for the latter

word, and by asserting that its use in this island is certainly post-Saxon. *Cymry*, he suggests,* is compounded of *can* or *cyn* (the equivalent of the Latin *cum*, *con*) and *brog* of which the meaning is land. Cymry then would mean no more than *fellow-countrymen*, with which meaning may perhaps be connected the idea of fellowship or alliance in general.

This derivation, like many other derivations of national names, is plausible; but, if correct, is in no way a disproof of the connection between *Cymry* and *Cimmerii*. On the contrary, a people speaking the same language would be likely to express the same idea by the same word at different times, though perhaps the particular word, like the whole language, might be somewhat modified in the lapse of ages. So far as I am aware, no one has hitherto used any weapon but a sneer against the identification of the words Cimmerii, Cimbri, and Cymry. But though scepticism is much to be desired in philology I do not think that a sneer suffices to dispose of the facts that Celtic and especially High Celtic names of places

* *Gramm. Celt.*, p. 226. It is strange that few men can distinguish between the absence of evidence which proves a given proposition and the presence of evidence which disproves it. Those Roman writers whose works have come down to us do not mention the Cymry as inhabitants of Britain; therefore, it is argued, the word was not in use during the Roman occupation. This is like the argument of the Irishman, who said, when confronted with an eyewitness of his crime, 'Yes, there is one that saw me do it, but sure I can bring twenty that didn't see me.' The Welsh traditions may be worth little, but they are at least worth more than such reasoning as this.

are, as all philologists admit, sown broadcast over Europe; that Diodorus* reckons the Cimbri among the Celts; that the language of the Æstii who lived on the shores of the Suevic Sea resembled, according to Tacitus,† the language of the Britons; and that the tradition of the Triads traces the Cymry to the land where Constantinople now is.

It is not necessary for me to give all the details of the question, which have been already given by Thierry, Niebuhr, and Arnold.‡ I rely not only upon their evidence but upon evidence which I consider far more conclusive. It is only necessary to remark briefly in this place, that the Welsh of our time call themselves Cymry, and that the inhabitants of a great portion of Europe, and some portion at least of Asia have at some period in the world's history called themselves by a similar name. There is perhaps no national name which has undergone so little change from the earliest historical times to the present. Herodotus tells us of the Cimmerii who were invaded by the Scythians and retreated before them into the Persian dominions. And those Cimmerii have left their name in the Crimea to the present day. In later times the Cimbri held the country which we now call Jutland, and—if we may judge from the immense numbers which they poured down upon the

* Lib. v. 32.

† *Germ.* 45.

‡ Thierry, *Hist. des Gaulois*, Introd., pp. l.–xciv.; Niebuhr, *Kleine historische und philologische Schriften*, pp. 352–398; Arnold, *History of Rome*, vol. i. pp. 520–526.

Roman armies—a far greater extent of territory than the Cimbric Chersonese alone. It is probable, however, that even if the names Cymry, Cimbri, and Cimmerii are identical, the nations known by those names are only partially identical. Migratory and conquering tribes must of necessity become mixed to some extent whenever they seize upon territory inhabited by other peoples. The amount and character of the foreign element thus introduced must differ in different places and at different times. Sometimes a numerous population may be overpowered and may ultimately absorb the conquering element. Sometimes the invading tribe may find few or no previous possessors of the soil and may retain its national character intact.

If we bear well in mind this source of error we may perhaps safely accept the conclusion of M. Thierry that the whole country between the Black Sea and the German Ocean was held by the Cimmerii before the great increase of the Germanic race.* This theory presents no improbability when considered in connection with what history tells us of the pressure of Scythian and Gothic nations upon their neighbours, and with the fragments† which have been handed down to us of the Cimbrian language.

* Introd., p. lxxiii.

† They called a certain sea 'Morimarusa,' which, according to Philemon, meant, in their language, 'The Dead Sea.'—Pliny, iv. 27 (13). This, it must be recollected, is no philological conjecture but a definite statement made by Philemon and quoted by

But did not this nation, numerous as it must have been, and brave, as we know from its enemies that it was, succeed anywhere in attaining to a civilisation which could claim for itself the respect of posterity? Was the Druidic worship the highest development of which the ancient Cymry were capable? Has this people, remarkable for the fertility of its imagination, left behind no monuments of its artistic power? Or was it, from first to last, engaged in one long and disastrous struggle for existence? And did it never find any quiet nook on this earth where its intellect could advance towards maturity? A sad conclusion this, if we must adopt it, and one which would destroy all hope of comparing the developed English intellect with the developed Cymric intellect! And such a comparison as this is one of the most valuable resources of ethnology.

Pliny. It is a remarkable confirmation of the statement of Tacitus that the Æstii and the Britons spoke similar languages. The Welsh for the Dead Sea is at the present day Môr Marw. It will be remarked that in the old Cimbric language the name of the sea was *mori* while in modern Cymric it is môr. But it so happens that Zeuss, who had no idea of identifying the Cimbri with the Cymry, has remarked upon the loss of the final vowel in many Cymric words. And a comparison of the Cymric with the Hibernian form (*muir*) leads him to the conclusion that this very word môr once had the final vowel *i*.—Zeuss, *Grammatica Celtica*, p. 782. It may farther be added that in *maru-sa* is probably preserved an adjectival or participial termination which may be compared with the Greek participial form σα as e.g. in θανοῦσα It will presently appear that it is in the Greek rather than in any other of the Aryan languages that we may most reasonably look for such resemblances.

Let us then use philology as our sign-post—remembering always that it may have been twisted round and may mislead—and if it points to a high Celtic civilisation in any part of the ancient world, it may possibly not be lost time to travel in that direction.

Philologists have, as a rule, attended but little to the pronunciation of the languages which they have compared—a neglect generally the result of necessity rather than of choice. But it is strange that the existence of the two sounds of the English *th* in Welsh and in Greek has not attracted more attention. Those sounds are so unlike anything to be found in French or German, that their existence in a country so remote as Greece is startling, and establishes at once a *primâ facie* case for enquiry.

Until Prichard wrote his work on the *Eastern Origin of the Celtic Nations*, it was assumed by most philologists that the Celtic languages had no real connection with the Indo-European, or, as they are now called, the Aryan languages. That they belonged to one and the same family he succeeded in demonstrating—but apparently not in convincing his brother philologists. Those who have made the Celtic languages their special study have corroborated all that Prichard has told us. But Professor Max Müller, though apparently allowing the claim of the Celtic languages to a place in the Aryan family, seems to regard them as very distant relatives of the better known tongues. 'Celtic

words,' he says,* 'may be found in German, Slavonic, and even in Latin, *but only as foreign terms*, and their amount is much smaller than commonly supposed. A far larger number of Latin and German words have since found their way into the modern Celtic dialects, and these have frequently been mistaken by Celtic enthusiasts for original words, from which German and Latin might, in their turn, be derived.'

This is an objection which Edward Lhuyd, the father of comparative philology,† anticipated and answered, more than a century and a half ago. If all the Latin words in the Celtic languages are borrowed, he asks, how happens it that there are words in Welsh which approach the Greek forms even more nearly than they approach the Latin—which approach them even when there is no similar

* *Lectures on the Science of Language*, first series, third edition, p. 200. I must, however, confess that I do not quite understand this passage. If all words common to Celtic and other languages are foreign terms introduced into those other languages, the theory of common origin must be given up, and the Celtic languages must be excluded from the Aryan family. But this is certainly not Mr. Max Müller's meaning. He is apparently opposing those old-fashioned philologists who have implied that Celtic languages in their present form are the parents of other Aryan languages. It is very much to be regretted that so distinguished a philologist has not given us more in detail his opinions of the Celtic languages and their relations.

† Lhuyd made the discovery, which seems to be considered quite modern by many philologists, that the changes in the persons of verbs are effected by pronouns; he, too, pointed out that the Celtic pronouns would explain the inflexions of the Latin verbs. *Archæol. Brit.*, p. 268.

Latin equivalent? It is unfortunate that Lhuyd contented himself with giving some score of instances not all very happily chosen, and in themselves perhaps hardly sufficient to prove his point. There exists, however, ample evidence to prove the point and to prove considerably more. That evidence is not irrelevant to the subject of this essay, if the conclusion which it suggests can be established also on other grounds. Let us then at once bring forward the evidence, and afterwards examine what other grounds there may be for or against the conclusion which a mere philologist would be disposed to deduce from it.

In the first place it will perhaps be best to give a table showing some of the coincidences of Greek with Welsh; it will then be necessary to show how those coincidences differ from the coincidences of Greek with other Aryan languages, and to decide, if possible, to what kind of connection, if any, between the Greeks and the Welsh those coincidences may point.

Greek.	Welsh.
αἰθάλη* soot, smoke	*huddygl*, soot
ἅλς salt	*halen*, salt
ἄλλος other	*all*, *llall*, other

* Nearly two thirds of these coincidences have already been pointed out by Edward Lhuyd, Prichard, or Pugh, though not always in the same form as by myself; but I do not remember that I have in the course of my reading met with the particular instances to which I have called attention by an asterisk. A far greater number of words are given by Pugh in the appendix to his Welsh dictionary, but he has injured his own cause by a too enthusiastic and unscientific search for resemblances. I have preferred to cite only cases to which I think no sound philologist can reasonably object.

GREEK.	WELSH.
ἅλλομαι* to leap	*llamu*, to skip, stride
ἀνάγκη * necessity	*angen*, necessity
ἀμφί about, around, &c.	*am*, about, around
ἀρά * prayer *	*aro*, I pray; *ariawl*, entreaty
αρι,* ερι intensive prefix: ἀρείων better; Ἄρης the god of valour and vigour	*ar*, *er*, intensive prefix: *arial*, vigour
ἀριθμός* number	*rhif*, *rhifedi*, number; *rhifnodi*, numeral
ἄρκτος a bear	*arth*, a bear
ἄω, ἄημι to blow; αὐλός a pipe	*awel*, a breeze; *awell*, a pipe
ἀχλύς darkness	*achlud*, obscurity
βαιός little	*bach*, little
βαίνω to mount, cause to mount	*banu*, to elevate, set up
βίος life	*byw*, alive; *bywyd*, life
βιός a bow	*bwa*, a bow
βουκόλος a herdsman	*bugail*, a herdsman
βοῦς bullock, cow	*bu*, *buwch*, cow
βουνός a hill	*ban*, high, a peak
βόσκω to feed	*pesgu*, to feed
βρύω* to be full of, to cause to come forth; ἔμβρυον† the embryo	*bru*, the womb; *brwys*, luxuriant
γάνος exultation, brightness	*hoen*, liveliness
γαῦρος overbearing, majestic	*cawr*, a majestic man, a giant
γένειον chin; γνάθος jaw; γένυς under-jaw	*gên*, chin, jaw, mouth
γέρανος crane	*garan*, crane
γέρας* gift of honour, reward	*gobr*,* reward, recompense
γίνομαι to be born	*geni*, to be born
γυνή woman	*geneth*, girl
γλοιός gum	*glud*, glue
γωνία* angle, corner	*congl*, angle, corner
δαήρ ‡ a brother-in-law	*daw*, *daw-awr*, a son-in-law

† ἔμβρυον is generally considered to be τὸ ἐντὸς βρύον. Is it not rather that which is inside the womb? may we not suppose some Greek word equivalent to *bru* to have been lost?

‡ This is not the only instance of a word being used to represent two different kinds of connection by marriage: e.g. ἑκυρός step-father, and *socer*, father-in-law.

GREEK.	WELSH.
δακρύω to weep; δάκρυ tear	*dagru*, to weep; *dagr*, tear
δαμάω† to tame	*dofi*, to tame
δείκνυμι to show, point out	*dangos*, to show, exhibit
δέρκομαι to see	*edrych*, to look, see
δῆλος clear, certain	*dilys*, clear, certain
δῆρις strife, quarrel	*deriad*, bickering
δονέω* to shake, agitate as the wind does	*ton* wave, breaker; *mordònau*, sea-breakers
δρῦς oak	*derw*, *derwen*, oak
δωρέω to present	*dyroï*, to present
ἐγγύς near	*wnc*, *agos*, near
εἰλύω to cover	*hulio*, to cover
ἑκυρός step-father	*chwegrwn*, father-in-law; *chwegr*, mother-in-law
*ἐθέλω to wish, with a choice implied	*ethol*, to select, choose
εἴδωλον image; εἶδος* form, and the termination ειδης* like: e.g. κυνοειδής like a dog	*delw*, image; the termination *aidd*, e.g. *ciaidd*, like a dog
ἐλαύνω* to drive	*hela*, to drive, to hunt
ἕλιξ* twisted like osiers	*helyg*, willow, osier
ἐρῶ I will say, tell	*arebu*, to talk wittily; *areb*, the faculty of speaking
ἔπω to say	*eb*, *ebu*, to say
ἐσθίω* to eat	*ysu*, to eat
ἐσθλός* good	*lles*, benefit; *llesol*, good
ἔτι yet	*eto*, yet
ἕτερος other, second, &c.	*eithr*, except, besides
ἤδη* already	*wedi*, afterwards; in its idiomatic use nearly equivalent to ἤδη
ἥλιος the sun	*haul*, the sun
ἧλος* nail	*hoel*, *hoelen*, nail
ἦλυθον I went, came	*elu*, to go
ἠρέμα stilly, quietly	*araf*, slow, still
ἡσυχία peace, quiet	*heddwch*, peace

† It will subsequently be seen that *m* is frequently changed into *f* in Welsh.

Greek.	Welsh.
ἦχος, ἠχή a cry, scream; ἠχέω to cry out	*aich*, a scream, plur. *eichiaw*; *eichio*, to cry out
θάρρος* courage	*dewr*, brave
θολός filth	*tail*, dung
θύρα, θυρίς door	*trwy*, through; *drws*, door
ἴδιος one's own, proper to	*eiddo*, one's own, proper to
ἵνα that, in order that	*hyna*, that
ἱστορέω to enquire, &c.	*ystyrio*, to consider
ἱστορία enquiry, &c.	*ystyr*, meaning, &c.
καλέω to call	*galw*, to call
κάμπτω to bend	*camu*, to bend
†καταῤῥάκτης* waterfall	*rhaiadr*, waterfall
κάρηνον head, skull	*creuan*, head, skull
καυχάομαι to boast, pretend	*coegio*, to pretend
κέντρον* point, spike, goad	*cethr*, ‡ spike; *cethrëu*, to drive
κεύθω to hide	*cuddio*, to hide
κλειτός renowned; κλυτός renowned; κλέος glory, &c.	*clod*, praise, fame, &c., connected with *clywed*, κλύω, &c.
κλάω, -σω to break	*cleisio*, to bruise
κλίνω to cause to lie down	*cleinio*, to lay prostrate
κλύω to hear	*clywed*, to hear; *clust*, ear; *clyw*, sense of hearing
κναίω to scrape, gnaw	*cnoi*, to gnaw
κοῖλος hollow; κοιλία belly	*cyl*, a hollow; *cylla*, maw, stomach
κόπτω to strike	*cobio*, to thump
κρούω to strike, beat	*curo*, to strike, beat
κρύος* cold, frost	*rhew*, cold, ice, frost
κύκλος [κυλλός] circle	*cylch*, circle
κύων dog	*ci*, dog
κύμβη a hollow	*cwm*, a hollow
κῶνος a cone	*con*, pointed, a peak, cone
λαλέω to chatter	*llolio*, to talk gaily, &c.
λανθάνω* (root λαθ-) to escape notice	*llechu*, to skulk; cf. λίθος *llech*

† Cf. ῥήγνυμι, q. v.

‡ This might appear doubtful but for the existence of the cognate form *kentar* in old Cornish.

Greek.	Welsh.
λείριον lily	*llyren*, water-plantain
λίμνη lake	*llyn*, lake
λίθος, λᾶας stone	*llech* a flat stone
λιπος,* λιπαρός fat	*llipa*, *llipan*, flabby, glib
λύρα a lyre	*llyry*† a tortoise
μέθυ wine; μεθύσκω to be drunk	*meddw*, drunk
μηρία thighs	*morddwydd*, thighs
μῆτις consideration, counsel, craft; μήδομαι to be minded, to contrive	*meddwl*, mind, thought
μέτρον measure	*meidr*, *mydr*, measure
μόνος alone	*mon*, isolated; cf. Mona
μύρμηξ ant; μυρμηδών ant-hill	*myr*, *myrion*, ants; *myrdwyn*, ant-hill
νεφέλη cloud	*niwl*, cloud, mist
νῆσος island	*y-nys*, island
νοῦς mind, disposition	*naws*, disposition, temperament
ξηρὸς,* χέρσος, χέρρος dry, parched	*cras*, dry, parched
ξυράω* to shave	*tori*, to cut
οἰδέω to swell	*chwyddo*, to swell
οἴγνυμι, οἴγω to open	*ag*, opening; *agenu*, to cleave open
ὅλος all, whole	*holl*, all, whole
ὀλισθάνω* to slip	*llithro*, to slip
ὁμαλός like	*hafal*, like; *malhau*,* to make like
ὄνομα name	*enw*, name
ὀξύς sharp	*awchus*, sharp
ὄρνις bird	*iâr*, hen
ὄρνυμαι* to start, be roused	*orni*, to start, rouse, threaten
πᾶ, Doric for πῆ or πῶς how	*pa*, how
πάγος sharp-pointed rock	*pig*, point
παίω to beat	*pwyo*, to beat
παύω to cease, pause	*peuo*, to pause
πέδιλον shoe	*pedol*, shoe
πέπτω to cook, bake	*pobi*, to bake

† A curious confirmation of the tradition that the lyre was first made of a tortoise-shell.

GREEK.	WELSH.
*πέρνημι** to sell	*prynu*,† to buy, take
πηνίκα when	*pan*, when
πορθμός ferry	*porth*, ferry
πρωΐ early morning	*boreu*, morning
πῶλος foal	*e-bol*,‡ foal
§*πλατύς*, *πλατύν* broad; *πλατύνω** to extend, widen	*llydan*, broad; *llydanu*, to extend, dilate
πλάδος *moisture	*llaith*, moist
*πλάγιος** oblique *πλατύς** flat	*lledd*, flat *lledd*, oblique; *lledbai*, awry
*πολύς** much, many	*lluosog*, numerous
*πέλανος** liquid, half-liquid	*llynol*, liquid
πελός,* *πελλός*, *πελιδνός* livid	*llwg*, livid. There is probably too a connection between *πελιδνός* and *llwyd* in the sense of 'brown'
πύλχος,* Æolic for *ὄχλος* a crowd	*llu*, a crowd, throng, host‖
*παλεύρια** decoy	*llith*, lure, bait
*παλάμη** palm	*llaf*, palm; *llaw*, hand¶
ῥᾴδιος easy	*rhwydd*, easy

† The difference in meaning between the Greek word and the Welsh word need occasion no surprise when it is remembered that the earliest form of buying and selling is barter; every buyer is then also a seller, and every seller a buyer. It is, however, possible that *prynu* may be a corruption of the Latin *prehendo*; but there is, I believe, no reason to suppose that the latter word was ever used in the sense of 'to buy.'

‡ In this, as in many other cases, Zeuss has shown that the *media* has taken the place of a previously existing *tenuis*. *Gram. Celt.*, p. 183.

§ It will be observed from this and some of the following instances that the Greek *πλ* either with or without a short vowel interposed frequently appears as the Welsh *ll*.

‖ The Welsh furnishes a connecting link between *λαός* and *ὄχλος*.

¶ This last instance may seem somewhat forced, but is not so in reality. *f* is in Cymric frequently substituted for *m*, and

GREEK.	WELSH.
ῥέω*, ῥεύσομαι to flow; ἐρύσσω* [ἐρύω] to draw, &c. †	*rhysio*, to rush, straiten; *rhysu*, to rush, entangle
ῥήγνυμι* to break, rend, tear	*rhwygo*, to rend, tear
ῥητορική* rhetoric (ἐρῶ)	*areitheg*, rhetoric
ῥίς, ῥίν nose	*rhŷn*, point, cape; *trwyn*, nose
σκότος darkness; σκιά shadow; συσκιάζω to overshadow	*cysgod*, shadow; *cysgodi*, to overshadow
σκάφη skiff, boat, &c.	*ysgraff*, skiff, boat, &c. Armorican *scâff*
σταῖς* dough	*toes*, dough
συνερίζω* to contend; ἔρις strife	*ymryson*, to contend
τάλας wretched; τλάω to suffer τλήμων	*tlawd*, poor, wretched
τείνω to stretch, pull out, extend	*tynu*, to pull, draw; *taenu*, to spread, expand
τῆλε* ‡ afar, far off	*pell*, far off, distant
τερέω to bore	*trwy*, through
τέρην smooth, delicate	*tirion*, pleasant, tender
τέττα* father; also τάτα	*tad*, father §
τίθημι to put	*dodi*, to put
τιτθός teat	*teth*, teat
τίς, πίς who?	*pwy*, who?
τροχός‡* wheel; τρέχω to run; τροχαλός running	*troell*, wheel; *treiglo*, to roll, wheel, run in the sense of trickling
τρίβω to rub	*rhwbio*, to rub

instances of such a change in the middle of a word occur in *hafal*, which is equivalent to the Greek ὁμαλός; in *araf* (ἠρέμα), in *of* (ὠμός) &c., and the Latin word *palma* actually exists in Cymric, in the form *palfa*. It is then easy enough to see that παλάμη = *llame* = *llaf-e*; and *llaf* and *llaw* are evidently two forms of the same word.

† *Each* Cymric word seems to stand for *both* Greek words.

‡ The interchange of *p* and *t* is further illustrated below.

§ It is curious to find the same form in Frisian (*täte*). This may be a trace of their language left by the old Cimbri. But I do not wish to insist very strongly on this point because I believe the words expressing '*Father*' and '*Mother*' to have been formed

Greek.	Welsh.
τύχη* hap, chance	*dygwydd*, hap, chance
τυφλός blind	*dall*, blind
ὑγιής healthy; ἰάομαι to heal	*iach*, healthy, whole, sound
ὕδωρ water	*dwfr*, *dwr*, water
ὕπνος sleep	*hepian*, nod, slumber; *hepio*, to nod; *hun*, sleep.
ὗς sow	*hwch*, sow
φάω to shine	*ffaw*, radiant
φαῦλος* vile, bad, base	*gwael*, vile, base
φλέγω, φλεγέθω to blaze	*ffaglu*, to blaze
φορβή pasture	*porfa*, pasture
χαλεπός hard	*caled*, hard
χθές yesterday	*doe*, mut. *ddoe*, yesterday
χρώς skin	*croen*, skin
ᾠδή,* ἀοιδή song	*awd*, song
ὠθέω to push	*gwthio*, mut. *wthio*, to push
ὠκεανός ocean	*eigion*, ocean
ὠλένη elbow	*elin*, elbow
ὠμός raw	*of*, raw, crude
ὠρύομαι to howl	*gawri*, to howl, shout
ὠόν egg	*wy*, egg

It will be admitted that these coincidences are remarkable. And yet the foregoing table cannot be considered a complete representation of the resemblances between the two languages. A great number of derivatives † from nearly all the cited words

by onomatopœia in all the Aryan and some other languages. The first cries uttered by infants are somewhat like *da-da*, *ma-ma*, *ba-ba*, *pa-pa*. Nothing is more natural than that the parents should have been named from these first sounds. It is a curious fact that our word expressing indistinct speech is the same as the German word expressing mother (*Mutter*). I need hardly add that *tad*, *täte*, πατήρ, father, are all variations of one and the same root.

† A complete catalogue of the parallel forms in the two languages would, I suspect, occupy a space hardly less than the

in both languages, and a great number of words common to Greek, Welsh, and other Aryan languages might have been added—enough indeed to constitute altogether a language by no means despicable; but it will be seen that the words above cited are, with few exceptions, remarkable either for their absence from other Aryan languages or for the greater similarity of their forms in Greek and Welsh. The only additions which I shall make to the list are a few coincidences which are perhaps still more remarkable than those which have been given above.

And, first of all, the numerals:—

Greek.	Welsh.	Greek.	Welsh.
1 εἷς, ἕν	un	4 τέσσαρες, τέτταρες, πίσυρες	pedwar
2 δύω, δύο	dau	5 πέντε, πέμπε	pump
3 τρεῖς, τρία	tri	6 ἕξ	chwech

whole of the present volume, and I am surprised that competent philologists have not hitherto entered upon this field of enquiry. But in this essay, which I have endeavoured to popularise as much as the subject would permit, such a catalogue would obviously be out of place and would be out of all proportion to the other parts of the work. I can at present therefore only give a few instances of derivatives from one root:

Greek.	Welsh.
κύκλος circle	*cylch*, circle
κυκλάς, -άδος that which encircles or lies in a circle	*cylched*, circumference
κυκλόω to encircle	*cylchu*, to encircle
κύκλωμα that which is rounded, a wheel	*cylchwy*, that which is rounded, a shield
κυκλίσκος little circle, circlet	*cylchig*, little circle, circlet

It may be remarked that in Welsh, *ig* is a common form of the diminutive and is obviously connected with the Greek ισκος.

Greek.	Welsh.	Greek.	Welsh.
7 ἑπτά	saith	20 εἴκοσι	ugain (*Corn.* igous, a corruption of ugons)
8 ὀκτώ	wyth		
9 ἐννέα	naw		
10 δέκα	deg	10,000 or an indefinite number μυριάς -άδος	myrdd

It will be remarked that neither the Low Celtic nor any of the Teutonic dialects agree so closely as the Welsh with the Greek.

But the connection between the two languages is still closer than we might be led to expect from a comparison of the numerals or any of the words given in the table.

Dedd in Welsh, means *law, order.* Here is an obvious connection with the Greek root τι, θε, with τίθημι and θέμις. *Dedd* = τὸ θετόν (that which is laid down); it approaches the Sanskrit *dadha-mi* still more closely. The word is very valuable as showing that notions of law and order found their way into Britain from an Aryan starting-point, and that the starting-point was not Rome.

Crafu, in Welsh, means to scratch, and γράφω means, in Greek, to write. Writing, in primitive times, was scratching, and men must have learned to scratch before they learned to write; we may then reasonably suppose that writing was the secondary, scratching the primary meaning of *crafu* or γράφω. And it is curious to find the same word in Latin, *scribo* = *ysgrafu* to scrape or scratch.

An enthusiastic philologist would conclude from these facts that one and the same people introduced

the art of writing into Greece and Italy; and that they were the people who used the word *crafu* or *ysgrafu*. We are not justified in concluding so much, because another hypothesis will equally well explain the facts. It is possible that when the art of writing was introduced into each of those two countries by Phœnician or other travellers, the word *crafu* or *ysgrafu* might have been in common use there, and might have been made to serve for the new art rather than a foreign word of similar signification.

Ymafael,* in Welsh, means *wrestling*. In Greek, πάλη means wrestling, παλαίω and συμπαλαίω to wrestle. *Ymafael*=ἀμαπάλη, if I may be permitted to coin such a word. It will be necessary to refer, in another chapter, to this evidence of a common sport designated by a common name in two countries

* It may, perhaps, be objected that *ymafael* is a compound of *ym* and *gafael* (grasp). But this very word *gafael* is another instance of the intimate connection between Greek and Welsh. The root ἑλ in Greek has the signification of seizing or grasping. This root becomes *gvel* when digammated, or rather when we restore the original digamma which has apparently dropped into a mere breathing. It may be still further objected that πάλη is connected with πάλλω rather than with ἑλ or Fελ. The truth is that all these words are probably very nearly allied. But the connection of πάλη with παλάμη is closer, so far as the meaning of the two words is concerned, than with πάλλω. And all analogy leads us to infer that παλάμη (a hand) is connected with some verb-root of which the primary signification is *to grasp*. χείρ, for instance, is connected with *hri* and αἴρέω, μάρη with μάρπτω. I think, then, that I am justified in referring *ymafael* and πάλη to a common root.

so far apart as Greece and Britain. The signification of *ym*, be it remembered, is very nearly the same as that of σύν in συμπαλαίω.

But there is a double coincidence still more striking in the words ἐνναίω,* ναιετάω, ναός, compared with the words *anneddu* and *neidrwydd*. Ναός, in Greek, means *a house*, or, *par excellence*, *the* house—as we say 'The House of God'—a temple; and ναίω, ἐνναίω, ναιετάω mean *to dwell in a house*. On exactly the same principle, *anneddu* means *to dwell*, and *neidrwydd* means *the temple*. We may argue from these facts, that the connection between the two peoples, of whatever kind it may have been, extended even to common views of religious matters.

Attention should here be called to the fact that the ancient Britons could not have been quite so uncivilised as some authors have represented them. We may, after the preceding investigation, be perfectly certain that, before the Roman invasion, the Britons had ideas of law and order; valued fame and reputation; recognised family relations; worshipped their god or gods not only in woods but in some kind of building; had learnt to grind corn and make it into bread; had an idea of measurements and of number in the abstract; were lovers of oratory; were in the habit of using nails, shoes, or sandals, boats of some kind, and wheels; indulged in fermented liquors; could speak of certain intellectual functions; and had some knowledge of artistic representation.

All this is not quite what might be expected from the savages whom Cæsar upon hearsay describes as inhabiting the interior.

But we have yet to determine what is the nature of the connection between the Greek and Cymric tongues. Is it no more than exists between all the Aryan languages? Certainly we may conclude that it is something more; there is evidence of this fact not only in the number of words which are similar in the two languages, but in the nature of that similarity. As in the numerals, so in almost all the words, the agreement is closer in the case of Greek and High Celtic than in the case of Greek and any other modern language; closer in some respects than in the case of High Celtic and any other modern language. In Cymric, when compared with Greek, we find not only the same root, but the same root in the same form. A great number of resemblances might be pointed out between Greek and German, between Greek and Low Celtic; but, though the root may be common, the forms differ.

And this fact is the more remarkable when it is remembered that the comparison is made between modern Cymric and ancient Greek. A comparison of ancient Greek with ancient Latin shows that precisely those specific differences existed between the two languages which now exist between High and Low Celtic. A comparison of modern Cymric with modern Greek shows that not even the lapse of twenty centuries has sufficed to separate the two

tongues so widely as, in certain respects, Greek and Latin were separated twenty centuries ago.

The aspirate in Greek is represented by the aspirate in Cymric; but it becomes a sibilant in Latin, in German, and in Low Celtic.* That which is π in Greek, is still generally *p* in Cymric; but in Latin and Low Celtic it becomes, *c*, *qu*, *k*, or *ch*; and in German it becomes *f*;—for instance, Greek πέμπε (or πέντε), Cymric *pump*, Latin *quinque*, Erse *kuig*, German *fünf*.

These rules are, however, not without one or two exceptions. The Greek ἕδρα appears in Cymric as *sedd*. This, however, may possibly be no real exception, because *sedd* may have been adopted from the Roman *sedes*. But there is, beyond all question, an exception in the case of the Cymric *saith* as compared with the Greek ἑπτά. And inasmuch as *saith* very nearly approaches the Erse *seacht*, differing from it only as *wyth* differs from *ocht*, we may not unreasonably conclude that Cymric is not a purely High Celtic language, but is slightly tainted by a Low Celtic dialect. And this is precisely what we might expect, if there be any truth in the theory that the Gael preceded the Cymry in Britain.

The Greek π sometimes appears in modern Cymric as *b*, as in the words πῶλος *e-bol*, πρωΐ *boreu*; but the substitution of the media for the tenuis is, as I have before remarked, a recent innovation in Cymric itself. That which is *p* in Greek, sometimes appears

* See Prichard, *Eastern Origin of the Celtic Nations*, p. 176.

as *t* in Cymric, and *vice versa;* for instance, the Greek τῆλε appears as the Cymric *pell;* πατήρ is *tad*, and τίς (τί) is *pwy*. But this interchange of labial and dental is only another testimony to the intimate connection between Greek and Cymric; just as *p* and *t* are interchangeable in Greek and Cymric, they are interchangeable in the different dialects of Greek itself e. g. τέϝσαρες and πίσυρες; πέμπε and πέντε.

There is an exception to this general agreement in the fact that in Cymric the initial *s* is never followed by a consonant, while in Greek such combinations are frequent. But even in Greek there is a trace of a similar aversion to such combinations. In the word ἀ-στήρ, a vowel is prefixed to the root, as sometimes in Welsh. And, on the other hand, Armorican, closely allied as it is to Cymric, displays no such aversion.* In Armorican the Cymric *seren*—the Greek ἀ-στήρ—becomes *steren*. Such a variation in dialects so closely allied as Cymric and Armorican, makes it probable that this particular difference between Cymric and Greek is of no real importance.

It is also worthy of remark that both languages show a tendency to prefix a vowel to the root, though that root may have only a single initial consonant. On the one hand, the Greek νῆσος may be compared with the Cymric, *y-nys*; on the other hand, the Cymric *dant dannedd* may be compared with the Greek ὀ-δόντ-ες.

* Rev. R. Garnett's *Essay on the Languages and Dialects of the British Islands*, p. 153.

It has also been pointed out that Cymric agrees with Sanskrit and with Greek in indicating a past tense by an augment.*

But enough has surely been said, to prove that the connection between Greek and Cymric—or rather High Celtic—is of the closest kind, and may be followed out into the minutest details. Our task is now to ascertain whether this connection between the two languages implies any community of blood in the two peoples. It will be remembered that the law arrived at from the examination of the chief philological phenomena of historical times was that, 'Wherever any given people speaks a language spoken by any other given people, there has been, at some time, a connection of some kind between those two peoples.'

This is the utmost that can be with safety asserted; and it must be borne in mind that even this connection may be indirect. It is not impossible that one nation might adopt the language of another, and transfer that language to a third, in which case there would be hardly any connection between the third nation and the first. We must therefore not attach too much importance to the fact that the Cymry who dwelt on the shores of the Black and

* Rev. R. Garnett, *On the Origin and Import of the Augment in Sanscrit and Greek*—Essays, p. 205, *et seq.* Zeuss, however, gives this the name of *particula verbalis.* It is not, like the Greek augment, inseparable from the verb; and there are *particulæ verbales* which indicate other tenses besides the past. Still there can be little doubt that the Greek augment had a similar origin. See Zeuss, *Gram. Celt.* pp. 419-427.

Caspian Seas, the Cymry who dwelt in Jutland, the Cymry who dwelt in Britain, and the tribes of ancient Greece spoke very similar languages. The evidence is worth very little, if no other evidence can be found pointing in the same direction.

If the connection between the ancient Britons and the ancient Greeks was as close as the foregoing considerations would lead us to believe, it may not unreasonably be asked—Do the traditions of the two countries lend any support to the conclusion? Undoubtedly they do. The Triads tell us that the Cymry came from the country called Deffrobani, where Constantinople now is. And this is very near the spot where the Cimmerii once had their seat; it is the quarter from which they would come when hard pressed by the Getæ and the Scythians. And, 'according to our Bardic documents, the Cymry have preferred their claim to an ancient connection with not only the territories but the mythology of Greece.'* Nor is the tradition merely one-sided. It is unnecessary to cite here the whole of the often-quoted passage in which Diodorus† refers to Hecatæus and others as his authorities, in which he tells us of the Hyperboreans, their island lying opposite to 'Celtica,' their intimate relations with the Greeks, their great spherical (circular?) temple,‡ their *harpistry* and their worship

* Davies, *Celtic Researches*, p. 176. † Lib. ii. 47.

‡ The remains of which probably exist at Abury or Stonehenge, unless indeed some similar structure in the neighbourhood of the Cimbric Chersonese is referred to.

of Apollo.* But there are a few words which must be quoted: 'The story runs that some of the Hellenes crossed over to the Hyperboreans, and left with them very precious offerings bearing inscriptions in the Hellenic character (*γράμμασιν Ἑλληνικοῖς ἐπιγεγραμμένα*).'

It is curious that this fact of the inscription being in the Greek character should be noticed; and it may not be unreasonable to infer that the Greek character was intelligible to the Hyperborean priests of Apollo, though their dialect was, as Diodorus tells us, peculiar to the Hyperboreans. And there is nothing improbable in the statement that Greeks found their way to Britain, if we admit that Phœnicians found their way thither. These traders would almost certainly man their vessels, in part, with Greeks picked up from the islands of the Ægean or from the shores of Attica and the Peloponnesus. And when the Greek sailors returned with their accounts of the Hyperboreans, Greeks of a higher class, always lovers of adventure, would afterwards take their passage in the Phœnician merchantmen.

* There is an intimate connection between harpistry and the worship of Apollo which is illustrated by the following passage from *Plato's Republic*, b. 3: p. 83.

Λύρα δή σοι, ἦν δ' ἐγώ, καὶ κιθάρα λείπεται, καὶ κατὰ πόλιν χρήσιμα· καὶ αὖ κατ' ἀγροὺς τοῖς νομεῦσι σύριγξ ἄν τις εἴη. Ὡς γοῦν, ἔφη, ὁ λόγος ἡμῖν σημαίνει. Οὐδέν γε, ἦν δ' ἐγώ καινὸν ποιοῦμεν, ὦ φίλε, κρίνοντες τὸν Ἀπόλλω καὶ τὰ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος ὄργανα πρὸ Μαρσύου τε καὶ τῶν ἐκείνου ὀργάνων. Μὰ Δί', ἦ δ' ὅς, οὔ μοι φαινόμεθα.

But what shall we say when we find the authority of Cæsar * for the statement that the Druids used the Greek character in writing? The statement would be incredible if other evidence had not prepared us to receive it; it is but the natural climax to the evidence which has already been collected. Let the coexistence of the Greek γράφω and the Cymric *crafu* now be remembered, and let us no longer accuse Cæsar of telling a gratuitous falsehood—of all falsehoods perhaps the least likely to suggest itself to him. Let us rather allow, either that the Cymry were made acquainted with the art of writing before they branched off into Britain and Greece, or that, if the Phœnicians subsequently carried their letters to the shores of the two countries, the psychical characters of the two branches remained identical, and the modifications made in the Phœnician alphabet by the Greeks were precisely those made by the Britons. The former alternative is obviously the more probable, and we may, perhaps, conjecture that both Greeks and Britons learned to write on the shores of the Black Sea, before they were called either Britons or Greeks.

I do not doubt that I shall be accused of upholding a most improbable theory. Every theory which is new is at first considered improbable, and generally even absurd. But I ask those philologists and ethnologists (and they form the great majority) who believe that all people speaking languages of Aryan

* *De Bell. Gall.*, vi. 14.

origin are themselves of purely Aryan descent, to consider calmly the following question. Is it more probable that two peoples have one common element among other elements in their blood, or that nearly the whole of the inhabitants of Europe are descended from one pure and unmixed stock? On any theory it is more probable that two peoples are closely akin than that a greater number are equally near relatives. If the Aryan tribes were the first which peopled Europe different divisions of them must have left the cradle of their race at widely different times. And those which left at or about the same time must have had more in common than those which left long before or long after them. But if those Aryan tribes found others in occupation when they came to Europe, their blood must have been modified, perhaps absorbed, by the previous inhabitants. It is not only conceivable, but probable, that the density of the whole population differed widely in different districts. In some the Aryans may have remained nearly pure, in others they may have been almost entirely absorbed, in one place by a tribe of one blood, in another by a tribe of another. But if, in any two places, they remained nearly pure, or were absorbed by two tribes of common origin, the evidence of those facts need not surprise us.

Enough evidence has then, I think, been adduced to give us some hope, though certainly not enough to prove, that we have discovered a highly civilised High Celtic or Cymric people, with which may be

compared the highly civilised English of the present day. Evidence of a different character will, as will presently appear, confirm the evidence of philology, of tradition, and of those fragments of history which are intelligible only on the hypothesis above suggested.*

It will perhaps be allowed that a standard of High Celtic civilisation is an object of sufficient importance to justify the attempt to establish it in an essay on the origin of the English people. A comparison of ancient Greek characteristics, mental and physical, with those of the ancient Britons, the modern English, and the modern Germans, will lead to very curious results.

Before concluding this chapter, it may be well to call attention to the fact pointed out by Mr. Garnett,† that very many Celtic words (not merely collateral, not merely derived from a common Aryan source) are

* I have purposely omitted all comparison of minor ethnic names in ancient Britain and ancient Greece, because I firmly believe that in this branch of philology it is possible to make out a good case for any conceivable theory. It was hard to resist the temptation to say something about the Lloegrians, Locrians, Leleges, and Pelasgians; but I considered what had already been said about the Pelasgians, and refrained. Should, however, any one be in search of another pair of crackers for the Pelasgian nut, he may perceive from the instances given in my table that the Greek πλ, with or without a short vowel interposed, very often appears as the Welsh *ll*; *r* and *s*, as every one knows, are—but I am in danger of breaking a good resolution.

† Rev. R. Garnett, *Essays* p. 154: *On the Languages and Dialects of the British Islands.* The same fact is admitted by Mr. Max Müller in a passage already quoted.

to be found in the Slavonic and even in the Germanic languages. This fact may suggest that even the Germans themselves are not of pure German stock, but owe some of their blood to the Cimmerii, the former possessors of Europe: how much they may owe, philology cannot tell us. But should any one remain unconvinced by the arguments, adduced in the beginning of this chapter, that the proportion of foreign words found in any language will not suffice to give an estimate of the proportion of foreign blood in any given people, he may study with profit the essay of Mr. J. Davies, 'On the Connexion of the Celtic with the Teutonic Languages.'* It is there shown that there is such a connection, and that it appears stronger in the case of the Anglo-Saxon, and generally of the Low German dialects, than in the case of the High German. From other considerations it is not improbable that the westernmost of the Teutonic peoples were the most Celtised. If so, the German and Scandinavian elements introduced by the Anglo-Saxons and Danes were the least German—the most nearly akin to the British—which could have come from any Teutonic country.

Few philologists are bold enough to tell us that they have discovered traces of a pre-Celtic element in the dialects of our island. Some, however, assure

* *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 1857, pp. 61 *et seq.* I do not however commit myself to the assertion that *all* the instances given by Mr. Davies are genuine instances of philological agreement.

us that we may depend upon the analysis of language for the fact that we are in part descended from a Lappish or other Euskarian tribe; and Mr. Isaac Taylor does not hesitate to announce that the name of Britain itself is Euskarian.* But, when we call to mind the numerous plausible meanings which have been assigned to the words *Saxon*, *Frank*, *German*, *Pelasgian*, &c., it is impossible to have faith in the signification assigned to the name of any country or people. It is by no means improbable that there may be an admixture of Turanian blood in Britain. It is by no means improbable that the Erse or Gael were a mixed people—partly Cymric, partly perhaps Turanian; but if the fact can be demonstrated at all, it cannot be satisfactorily demonstrated from comparative philology alone.

And here I had perhaps better remark once more, that where my argument is merely philological I wish it to pass for no more than a philological argument. I have insisted on the presence of a common type of language in ancient Britain and ancient Greece. I do not argue that the people among whom that type of language is still preserved must of necessity be the best representatives of the people by whom it was originally spoken. Such an argument would be in direct opposition to the objections which I have raised against the exaggerated claims of philology. A particular type of language found its way into

* *Words and Places*, p. 60.

ancient Britain and into ancient Greece; and the evidence of physical and psychical characteristics renders it not improbable that the type of language was introduced into both countries by the same people or by two peoples very nearly akin. As an ethnic name for this one people, or as a generic name for the two divergent branches of this people, I use the term Cymry or High Celts; but I do not therefore mean to assert that the people now calling themselves by that name are the unmixed descendants of that original people. From the evidence brought forward in this and the following chapters, it appears that there existed in this island before the Roman invasion a people speaking a High Celtic language, possessing in many instances long and narrow heads, and endowed with psychical attributes which will be described hereafter. To this people, in order to avoid circumlocution, I give the name of Cymry. As I attach no more meaning than this to the word, my main arguments will hold good, even should subsequent researches prove it to be a misnomer.

CHAPTER III.

THE EVIDENCE OF PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS.

Evidence for the popular belief—The prevailing colour of the hair in England—Examination of the evidence respecting the prevailing colour of the hair among the ancient Germans, Gauls, Britons, and Anglo-Saxons—Examination of certain modern theories—General results of the investigation—Examination of the evidence respecting the stature, proportions, and general appearance of the above-mentioned ancient peoples—The modern English do not owe their stature exclusively, if at all, to the Saxons or Danes—The evidence of skulls and remains found in ancient burying-places—'The Crania Britannica'—The difficulty presented by the discovery both of the long and of the short forms of skulls in the most ancient burying-places.—Evidence that the long oval skull is characteristic of the Cymry—The typical English head is also of the long oval form, while the typical Teutonic head is of the short oval form—General results of the investigation—The predecessors of the Cymry in Britain were possibly Cymro-Turanians, some dolichocephalic, some brachycephalic—Agreement of the physical characteristics of the ancient Greeks with those of the ancient Britons and modern English.

In the previous chapters of this Essay, the evidence for the popular belief was considered by itself before any general investigation was attempted; and it is but right that the popular belief should be treated with equal respect throughout. But in the particular branch of our subject with which we are now concerned, it will not be difficult to show that the characteristics of the English people afford not the

slightest support to the popular theory. That theory starts with two assumptions, one of which is that the Anglo-Saxons were a fair-haired, red-haired, or flaxen-haired people; and the other, that the English are a fair-haired, red-haired, or flaxen-haired people. Of these two assumptions, the first may possibly be true, or on the other hand may possibly be an exaggeration; the second is directly opposed to facts. And, so far as physical characteristics are concerned, it is almost exclusively upon the colour of the hair that the popular belief is based. The Englishman may perhaps believe that his stature exceeds the stature of other men, and that his superiority is inherited from the Anglo-Saxons. The grounds for that belief will be investigated in this chapter; but in the mean time it may be safely assumed that the average Englishman has not studied craniometry in order to satisfy himself that he is a Saxon.

And now, let us ask, are the English a fair-haired people? Can it be said that 90 per cent. of them are fair-haired? Most certainly not. But any greater proportion than 50 per cent. would perhaps constitute them a fair-haired people. And are there more than 50 per cent. of fair-haired men and women among the English? Most certainly not. There are not 40 per cent. nor 30 per cent. of even moderately light-haired people among them. They are beyond all question generally dark-haired. This same fact has already been noticed by Prichard and others, but the proportions have generally been given without any

statement of the figures which establish them. The following statistics may therefore possibly be thought of some value. It would undoubtedly be more satisfactory to have a still greater number of instances, and instances taken from all parts of the country. But it must be remembered that London may be considered the representative of England*—that it is peopled not exclusively by Londoners, but by natives of all parts of the country. And it should also be stated that the proportions of different colours observed on any given day varied not very considerably from those observed on any other given day. It is therefore perhaps not unfair to assume that the percentage of the different colours is arrived at approximately at least, if not with minute accuracy. It should also be stated that wherever there was a doubt, the light-haired class received the benefit of it; and

* This assertion is based upon the best possible evidence. Upon reference to the *Population Abstract* published in 1843 (Census 1841), when railroads were in their infancy, it will be seen that of the inhabitants of Middlesex, 490,513 were born in other counties, and 967,166 in the county itself, while of the inhabitants of Surrey, 224,590 were born in other counties, and 329,473 in the county itself. From these statistics we may infer that few Londoners have an exclusively London ancestry. It is true that these figures may convey an exaggerated idea of the immigration into London from remote districts, because the two counties in which London principally stands are without doubt constantly interchanging their inhabitants. But if we make the most liberal allowance for this source of error, we may still look upon London as the representative of the whole country. The Census returns tell us further, that the intermixture of the population is becoming very general throughout the length and breadth of the island.

the nondescript colour, frequently seen among the Germans, which it is difficult to class as light or dark, as brown or yellow, appears in the second column of the table. A difficulty occurred in classifying the red-beards, which were sometimes found to accompany dark hair, sometimes yellow hair; in the former case they have been classed with the red, in the latter with the yellow. In order to include both sexes, the hair of the head has been made the basis of classification; but the dark-haired men's red beards have been classed with the red in order that the case against dark hair might be stated as strongly as possible. The figures must now speak for themselves.

Numbers observed.			
Red	Yellow and Light	Black and Dark Brown	Total
137	1065	3646	4848

Number per cent. (*Result carried only to one place of decimals.*)		
Red	Yellow and Light	Black and Dark Brown
2·8	21·9	75·2

Since the materials for this table were collected, Dr. Beddoe has most kindly placed at my disposal the results of his own observations in London. They are arrived at from about 6,000 instances. Dr. Beddoe makes a five-fold division; but I have added together the numbers of the brown, dark, and black

in order to facilitate comparison with my own table. The following are Dr. Beddoe's percentages:

Red	Fair	Brown, Dark, and Black
3·9	11·1	88·4

It will be remarked that the total of these numbers falls short of 100 by ·6. But Dr. Beddoe's division becomes fifteen-fold in his system of classification, which embraces the three principal colours of the eyes as well as the five of the hair; and the loss results from the division being in each case carried only to one place of decimals.

The discrepancy between Dr. Beddoe's table and mine may perhaps be attributed partly to my desire to do full justice to the fair-haired people, partly to my classification of the red beards, and partly to the difficulty of assigning a certain nondescript hue either to the class light, or to the class dark.

The above tables agree in the main with the estimate of Prichard,* who does not give his figures, that there are 80 per cent. of dark-haired people in England.

It should be, however, further stated that decidedly flaxen hair is very uncommon. The flaxen-haired were not distinguished from the other light-haired people in making these observations; but, if my own memory may be trusted, there were not half-a-dozen conspicuously flaxen-haired people among the whole

* *Researches into the Physical Hist. of Mankind*, vol. iii. p. 199.

4,848. The *chevelure dorée* and the true auburn are equally uncommon.

I do not of course mean to deny that there are parts of the country in which the inhabitants are generally fair-haired. 'The inhabitants of the north of England,' says Worsaae, 'bear on the whole, more than those of any part of that country, an unmistakeable personal resemblance to the Danes and Norwegians.' They differ from the inhabitants of the south, he adds, in the following respects: 'the form of the face is broader, the cheek-bones project a little, the nose is somewhat flatter, and at times turned a little upwards; *the eyes and hair are of a lighter colour*, and even deep red hair is far from being uncommon. The people are not very tall in stature, but usually more compact and strongly-built than their countrymen towards the south.'*

But while pleading for the resemblance of the northern Englishmen to the Danes, M. Worsaae is compelled to admit that the Englishmen of the south, the bulk of the population, and the representatives of the whole nation, are of a wholly different type, with dark hair and oval faces.†

So far, the investigation has presented no difficulty: the assumption that we are a fair-haired people is simply untrue; and we may, therefore, safely assert, that if the Anglo-Saxons were generally fair haired,

* *An Account of the Danes in England*, pp. 79, 80.

† *Ibid.* p. 78.

the colour of our hair does not establish our descent from them. But the popular theory may still be true by accident. It may be true, not because both the assumptions on which it is founded are true, but in spite of the fact that they are both false; and this possibility brings us into the midst of one of the greatest difficulties by which ethnology is surrounded.

It is easy to make strong assertions, but difficult to reconcile contradictory statements; whence it very naturally happens that ethnologists are apt to make up for the deficiency of their facts by the vehemence of their language. Dr. Knox tells us that we are Saxons, and that the Saxons * have 'fair hair with blue eyes.' He draws an admirable picture of a Saxon, and yet it is not unjust to say that his portrait is too highly idealised to be recognised in the original, if that original is the typical Englishman. Dr. Knox might have walked from Bayswater to Whitechapel, or from Highgate to Kennington, through the most crowded thoroughfares, without meeting a dozen of his truly fair-haired Saxons—a dozen with hair conspicuously light.

But a strong assertion goes a long way. Tacitus asserted that *all* the Germans of his time had hair of a yellow or reddish tint, blue eyes, and large frames.† It has apparently been assumed by many ethnologists

* *The Races of Men.* p. 50.

† 'Omnibus truces et cœrulei oculi, rutilæ comæ, magna corpora.' Tacit. *German.* iv.

that the Germans must have been our progenitors; and many have actually succeeded in persuading themselves, contrary to the evidence of their senses, that we resemble these hypothetical ancestors in all their characteristics. Every science has indulged in its own particular vagaries, but to ethnology belongs the singular honour of having succeeded in convincing her votaries that black is white, with the white and the black before their eyes.

Such enormous mistakes as these make us doubt any statements referring to the colour of the hair, unless those statements are accompanied by figures. Tacitus is perhaps more trustworthy than a modern ethnologist, because he had no favourite theory to uphold. And Tacitus is supported by other tolerably credible authors, as, for instance, Strabo and Cæsar. But none of these writers had any idea of scientific accuracy, of verifying first impressions by statistics. All that they say must, therefore, be received with caution. Their words may undoubtedly be received as an honest statement of their opinions. To Greek and Roman eyes the Germans did certainly appear, in general terms, to be all light-haired. There is no evidence whatever on the opposite side. But if we suppose the Greeks and the Romans to have been generally dark-haired, and to have regarded fair hair as a rare and very great beauty, they would necessarily have been very much struck by a proportion of light hair among the Germans greatly in excess of that which they found among themselves. When

they said that *all* the Germans had fair hair, they may have meant no more than that fair hair was by no means uncommon among the Germans. If now the ordinary acceptation of the word *rutilæ* be a little extended—if we suppose it to include all fair and red hair, and that dingy hue neither light nor dark which is very common among Germans, the description of Tacitus will not be found very inapplicable to the Northern Germans of the present day—to the people dwelling near the Rhine, to the people of Saxony, Prussia, Hanover, and Denmark.

There are, however, two other possible hypotheses which would account for existing circumstances: the first is, that the physical characteristics of the Northern Germans have changed since the time of Tacitus; the second, that Tacitus deliberately misrepresented the facts.

But there is no reason to suppose that Tacitus told a deliberate falsehood; and there are many reasons, as will presently be seen, against supposing that there has been a great change of physical characteristics in Germany and elsewhere. In the meantime it is an undoubted fact that no people can be pointed out who at once represent the Germans of Tacitus, and universally possess light hair.

Any theory may be considered untenable which is at variance with the facts on which it is supposed to be founded—an objection which applies to the following hypotheses. It has been asserted that town life has produced a change in the colour

of the hair and of the eyes, both in Germany and in England; that proximity to coals, in mines or in factories, or in houses, has had that effect; that the hair of mankind, regarded as a whole, grows gradually darker according to the progress man makes, just as the hair of the adult is darker than the hair of the child.

The last of these assertions is extremely flattering to the Negroes, but it is difficult to see what room is left them for further improvement, if the hair becomes darker as men grow wiser. It is not surely meant, that the Negroes are already our superiors, and that they have arrived at the highest point which man can attain. Let us rather hope that they may rise gradually higher without any consequent darkening of their skins or hair. The coal theory is too absurd for serious confutation. The influence of town life upon the hair is curiously contradicted by some of the evidence which is supposed to prove it; but the theory deserves a careful examination.

Dr. Beddoe, who has given great attention to the different varieties of hair, says, 'I am disposed to think that the xanthous temperament, though probably better adapted to the climate of these islands than the melanous, is less able to endure some of the anti-hygienic agencies which operate on the crowded populations of our great towns; and that thus the law of natural selection operates against its multiplication.'* Dr. Beddoe also gives some statistics to

* *Anthropological Review*, vol. i. p. 312.

show that a process of 'conjugal selection' is going on, by which the light-haired women are left unmarried, while the dark-haired find husbands, and bear children. As, however, the total number of women observed is no more than 737, and those only in one town and during a short period, it does not appear that anything is established beyond a *primâ facie* case for enquiry. In a paper,* however, which Dr. Beddoe has recently presented to the Anthropological Society of London, he accounts for the prevalence of dark hair in the towns much more satisfactorily. He suggests, that where the country shows a preponderance of light hair, there has probably been a settlement of light-haired people, and that the neighbouring towns have received settlers from various parts of the island. The towns are, then, the best representatives of the general population; and if dark hair generally prevails in English towns, as, with few exceptions, it does,† we may safely assert that it prevails generally among the English people. In the towns are, as a rule, to be found the descendants of the dark-haired Britons who sought refuge from the Saxon invaders, and of those more light-haired invaders themselves.

M. Esquiros tells us,‡ that 'all the races which

* Not yet published: its title is, *On the Testimony of Local Phenomena in the West of England to the permanence of Anthropological Types.*

† Dr. Beddoe. Same paper.

‡ *L'Angleterre et la Vie Anglaise*, vol. i. p. 124.

have contributed to the formation of the English nation—the Celts, the Saxons, the Danes, and the Normans—had light hair and blue eyes.' If this be true, and if it be also true, as M. Esquiros has suggested,* that it is town life which darkens the hair and the eyes, we ought, certainly, to find that dark hair prevails in *all* towns, and light hair in *all* rural districts. But what does M. Esquiros himself tell us? 'The prevailing characteristics in a great part of the Highlands, especially in the west, are black and straight hair, grey eyes, and a complexion which no longer possesses its original fairness.'† How can this statement be reconciled with the contradictory statement that the ancient type has been best preserved in the rural districts, especially in the well-wooded countries, and on the mountains? And not only is there this single contradiction—not only are the dark people found in the country, but the light people are occasionally found to predominate in the towns. It is in the town of Guildford, says M. Esquiros,‡ that we may best see beauty of the Saxon type. His description is so charming, that the temptation to quote it is irresistible; it is so essentially French that to translate it would be to spoil it.

* *L'Angleterre et la Vie Anglaise*, vol. i. p. 125. 'On a observé que partout dans les villes, la couleur des cheveux et des yeux est plus brune que dans les districts ruraux, surtout dans les bois, et sur les montagnes. Le type ancien s'est mieux conservé dans les endroits où il était en quelque sorte protégé par la nature; ailleurs il s'est altéré.'

† *Ibid.*

‡ *Ibid.* p. 106.

'Mais, si l'on veut former une idée de la beauté du type saxon, il faut regarder la *femme.* Elle se signale par des cheveux blonds, des yeux bleus, des lèvres vermeilles, des joues roses comme la fleur à laquelle elles ont été si souvent comparées, une peau aussi blanche et aussi transparente que l'albâtre, des traits délicats, des bras admirablement modelés, une contenance et une taille parfaites, un buste fin, un air de santé florissante, et pourtant distinguée.'

The theory, then, that town-life darkens the hair is doubly inconsistent with itself; and if we are to suppose that a general darkening of the hair has taken place in Germany and England, we must be content to assume that, which is in itself improbable, without having any certain evidence to support our assumption. And such a theory is, beyond all doubt, improbable when we consider that there is no known instance of any race having changed the colour of its hair in historical times.

It seems, then, the safest course to take the statements of Tacitus and his supporters *cum grano salis.* The grain of salt is all that is necessary to make those statements applicable to the present inhabitants of Northern Germany. And it seems all the more reasonable to apply this grain of salt to Tacitus's statements respecting the hair when we find that Blumenbach was compelled to apply it to his statements respecting the stature of the ancient Germans. The remains which have been discovered do not justify the assertion that all the Germans were large-

limbed, 'adeo ut ad hanc ipsius naturæ veritatem sublestior videatur fides et ad licentiam si non poeticam certe politicam referenda relatio scriptorum Romanorum de veterum Germanorum corporibus ingentibus, immanibus, altissimis.'

The Roman writers found more tall men among the Germans than among the Italians, and attributed superior stature to the Germans as a national characteristic. In precisely the same way they found fair hair more prevalent among the Germans than among the Italians, and attributed fair hair to the Germans as a national characteristic.

Thus, then, one of our difficulties disappears. The Northern Germans† and Scandinavians, presenting perhaps a less proportion of decidedly black and brown hair than any other races, were, *for Roman readers*, not unfairly described as generally fair-haired.

The colour of the Anglo-Saxon hair has generally been inferred from that attributed to the Germans by

* Blumenbach, *Nova Pentas Collectionis Craniorum*, p. 5.

† Dr. Beddoe, in the unpublished paper already referred to, says,—'The index of nigrescence is in the fair populations of Friesland, Lower Saxony, Westphalia, and the Lower Rhine, a minus number; it is so also in some of the Scandinavian districts of our own island. In most of the principal towns of England, it varies between 10 and 30, and in the Celtic districts of the far west of Ireland, and the Highlands, and Wales, it ranges from 30 to 50, 60, or even 70.' This index of nigrescence Dr. Beddoe obtains, he says, thus,—'In comparing the tendency to darkness of hair in any two sets of people, I take 100 of each, and then subtracting the red + the fair from the dark brown + twice the black, obtain a cipher which compendiously represents that tendency, and which I call the index of nigrescence.'

Roman writers—at least it is difficult to discover any other authority for it. Beda, it is true, gives us a short description of certain Anglians of whom Pope Gregory said, 'non Angli sed Angeli.' They were remarkable for their clear complexions, their handsome features, and the surpassing beauty of their hair.* It may perhaps be inferred that their hair was light because light hair was considered a beauty in Rome. But such an inference is not satisfactory evidence on the point in question; it is especially unsatisfactory when there is a suspicion that the Angles whom Gregory saw at Rome may have been Anglo-Britons —as much British as Anglian. We must then fall back upon the descriptions of the Roman writers and what we know of the present characteristics of the Northern Germans and Scandinavians; we shall then conclude that the Anglo-Saxons and Danes were probably like their modern representatives, somewhat more fair-haired than the present inhabitants of England. The Dutch would serve best as a standard of comparison if we could be certain that they are untainted by Spanish or Belgian blood. The Frieslanders, Dr. Beddoe tells us, are remarkably fair-haired. And M. Esquiros, in describing the Dutch generally,† speaks of beauties both blondes and brunettes, 'for black hair is not uncommon in the Netherlands.' These words seem to imply that black hair does not

* Beda, *Hist. Eccl.* lib. ii. cap. 1. ap. *Mon. Hist. Brit.* p. 148.—'Candidi corporis, ac venusti vultus, capillorum quoque forma egregia.'

† *La Néerlande et la Vie Hollandaise*, vol. i. p. 115.

preponderate;* and, if not, there must be a marked difference between the Dutch and the English. Here again is confirmation of the opinion that the modern English are somewhat more dark-haired than the ancient Saxons. And if so, why?

This question leads us to a difficulty as great as that which has just been discussed; what was the prevailing colour of the hair among the ancient Britons? Tacitus tells † us that the Caledonians had light hair; that the Silurians had swarthy ‡ (or ruddy) complexions, and curling hair, and might possibly have crossed over from Spain; and that those who were nearest to the coast of Gaul resembled the Gauls. 'But,' he adds, 'when all the facts are considered, it is probable that the Gauls took possession of the island near them.' The epithet which Tacitus applies to the complexion of the Silurians may mean dark, fair, brown, or red; but as he suggests that they may have been the descendants of some Iberian settlers, it seems most probable that by '*colorati*' he means swarthy. So far, then, as regards the Caledonians and Silurians, we have a tolerably definite statement. But what of those Britons—the majority—

* For M. Esquiros uses very different language when describing the English:—'Un fait me préoccupe, je l'avoue, quand je considère la population anglaise: c'est le grand nombre des cheveux et des yeux noirs.'—*L'Angleterre et la Vie Anglaise*, vol. i. p. 124.

† *Agric.* 11.

‡ *Colorati.*

who resembled the Gauls? The probability, which Tacitus suggests, that the whole island was peopled from Gaul might lead us to infer that, in addition to the Gallic type proper, whatever it may have been, there existed in Gaul individuals at least of the Caledonian and Silurian types. Nor is this improbable; for individuals of those types may be found there at the present time. But for a description of the Gallic type itself we must apply to other authors.

The passages in which the Gauls or Celts are described have been carefully collected by Prichard.* There is, at first sight, no discrepancy in the statements of the different authors. Poets, geographers, and historians, all attribute light hair to the Celts or Gauls. But the descriptions of the Celts must, like the descriptions of the Germans, not be taken too literally. As in the case of the Germans, so in the case of the Celts, we must believe no more than that the eyes of the Romans and Greeks were struck by the greater proportion of fair hair among the Celts than among their own people. But there is reason to believe that they were less struck with this phenomenon among the Celts than among the Germans. Strabo tells us,† that the Germans differed but little from the Celts except in possessing a greater stature and fairer hair.

There is some light thrown on the question by a

* *Researches into the Phys. Hist. of Man*, vol. iii. pp. 193-6.
† Lib. vii. ch. 2.

passage in Suetonius,* in which it is stated that certain Gauls were compelled by Caligula to make their hair light, or red, and to learn German. This is a direct proof that the art of changing the colour of the hair was known among the Romans and Gauls. Livy,† too, describes the Gauls as having *rutilatæ comæ* (reddened hair, or hair made light), not *rutilæ comæ* (red or light hair). It is true that the expression *rutilatæ* may be loosely used as a synonyme for *rutilæ*; but the strict rules of grammar lead us rather to the conclusion that the Gauls were in the habit of applying some preparation to their hair for the purpose of giving it a lighter hue, and that the Romans were not ignorant of the custom. Diodorus Siculus‡ has also made a statement to the same effect. This custom or fashion exists, unless the ladies are greatly calumniated, in France, and even in England, at the present time. Fashions repeat themselves, and light hair now has its turn again.

But the discovery of this custom helps us not a little in our attempt to ascertain the colour of the hair among the ancient Britons. Strabo tells us that the Britons were less fair-haired§ than the Celts. This fact, as M. Thierry has remarked, may be explained by the custom which, it is generally allowed, existed in Gaul, of colouring the hair.

It may perhaps by some physiologists be thought impossible that the Gauls could have possessed that

* *Calig.* xlvii.
† Lib. xxxviii. c. 17.
‡ Lib. v. 28.
§ *ἧσσον ξανθότριχες*, lib. v. ch. 2.

fiery temperament by which they have always been characterised, if they had generally fair hair and blue eyes. Could it be ascertained that a certain definite colour of the hair, skin, and eyes, invariably accompanies a certain temperament, the argument would be most conclusive; but, unfortunately, the question of temperament, like most other medical questions, is surrounded by all kinds of contradictions. The division of the temperaments, their external marks, even the propriety of admitting their existence, are all matters of dispute.* It would therefore, in the absence of statistics or other trustworthy evidence, be rash to found any argument on such a basis.

But apart from the question of temperament, the evidence already brought forward will enable us to arrive at a conclusion. In the first place the hair of the Celts or Gauls must have been somewhat darker than that of the Germans,—or rather there must have been a greater proportion of dark hair among the Gauls when their hair was left to itself. In the second place there was a greater proportion of dark hair among the Britons than among the Gauls when the latter stained their hair. Or, if we refuse to allow that the Gauls stained their hair, we have still evidence that the Britons were not so light-

* Todd, *Cyclopædia of Anatomy and Science.*—Article 'Temperament.' *Dictionnaire des Sciences Médicales.*—Article 'Tempéramens.' *Encyclopædia Britannica.*—Article 'Sanitary Science.' *Penny Cyclopædia.*—Article 'Temperament.'

haired as the Gauls, who, in their turn, were certainly not more light-haired than the Germans. The Britons must, then, on any supposition have had generally darker hair than the Germans, and there is, therefore, some reason to suppose that the greater prevalence of dark hair in England, as compared with modern Northern Germany, is due in part at least to the blood of the ancient Britons.

But it must not be supposed that the ancient Britons south of the Tweed were an exclusively dark-haired people, any more than that the Germans are or were an exclusively fair-haired people. The Welsh are not exclusively dark-haired; in North Wales fair hair is by no means uncommon,* perhaps, less uncommon than in England; in South Wales red hair is by no means uncommon.† Queen Boadicea herself is said to have had a profusion of very light hair which descended below her waist.‡ The difference between the Germans and the Britons was, and is, a difference of proportion, and that difference would probably appear most conspicuously upon a comparison of the numbers of people with black or unquestionably dark brown hair in the different nations. There are probably not very many more people with clear flaxen hair among the Northern Germans than among the English, but far more with

* As observed by Prichard (*Physical Hist. Mankind*, vol. iii. p. 199), and by myself.

† Dr. Beddoe, *Anthropological Review*, vol. i. p. 310.

‡ Xiphilinus, ap. *Mon. Hist. Brit.*, p. lvi. . . τήν τε κόμην πλείστην τε καὶ ξανθοτάτην οὖσαν μέχρι τῶν γλουτῶν καθεῖτο.

that dingy hair which is neither remarkably light nor remarkably dark, and which may accompany the phlegmatic temperament.

The hair of the modern English, then, seems to conform in type to that of the ancient Britons rather than to that of the ancient or of the modern Germans, or Saxons, or Scandinavians.

The stature and proportions of the Saxons, on the one hand, and of the ancient Britons, or of the Celts, on the other hand, have often been settled in that rough and ready manner which unfortunately characterises many members of the medical profession. Unfortunately, too, the dictum of a medical man is commonly looked upon as oracular; and his statements are often adopted without question by painstaking authors, just as his prescriptions are taken by confiding patients. On subjects with which he is supposed to be conversant his word is law; the patient who, with broken health and nerves unstrung, has submitted eagerly to his physician's directions cannot altogether shake off the habit of obedience, cannot resume his own right of forming his own opinion, even when his health is restored, and the physician is present only in print.

Reference has already been made to Dr. Knox's description of the Saxon. Here are his descriptions of the Saxon and of the Celt in full.

'In all climes, and under all circumstances, the Saxons are a tall, powerful, athletic race of men; the

strongest as a race on the face of the earth. They have fair hair, with blue eyes, and so fine a complexion that they may almost be considered the only absolutely fair race on the face of the globe. Generally speaking, *they are not a well-made or proportioned race, falling off most in the limbs*; the torso being large, vast, and disproportioned.'*

'War is the game for which the Celt is made. Herein is the forte of his physical and moral character; in stature and in weight as a race inferior to the Saxon; limbs muscular and vigorous; torso and arms seldom attaining any very large development—hence *the extreme rarity of athletæ* among the race; hands broad; fingers squared at the points; step elastic and springy; in muscular energy and rapidity of action surpassing all other European races. *Cæteris paribus*,—that is, weight for weight, age for age, stature for stature—the strongest of men.'†

M. Esquiros agrees, in some points, with Dr. Knox, differs from him in others. 'The structure of the skull apart,' says M. Esquiros,‡ 'the Saxons did not differ considerably from the Celts in their external characteristics; both had a fair and clear complexion; but the hair of the Saxons was of a redder hue, while that of the Celts was flaxen.' This description is evidently taken, in the main, from the ancient authors. The following seems to have been founded, partly at

* *The Races of Men*, p. 50.

† *Ibid.* p. 319.

‡ *L'Angleterre et la Vie Anglaise*, vol. i. p. 102.

least, upon M. Esquiros' own observations:—'The Saxon is recognised at once by his round and high-coloured face, by his powerful, fleshy, and *well-knit* [*compacte*] frame. The osseous system of the Saxons appears to be less developed than that of the Celts of Scotland; their stature, too, is inferior, but the shoulders are square and broad, *the arms muscular* [*nerveux*], the chest full. The legs and thighs do not correspond with the development of the upper part of the body. Perhaps this last characteristic may at once belong to the original type, and be a result of civilisation, which forces men to apply themselves to the mechanical arts. In the sedentary occupations the lower extremities are sacrificed to the development of the chest and arms. In this way the natural peculiarities of a race are increased even by the exercise of its instincts.'*

It is strange that one author should describe the Saxon as well-made, while the other describes him as ill-made; that one should describe his arms as brawny, while the other speaks of a falling off in his limbs. M. Esquiros is, however, the more consistent with himself, for, as a rule, the kind of exercise which will develop the arms will also develop the chest, and it would be impossible to give the chest a powerful muscular development without considerable exercise of the arms. The deltoids (muscles of the shoulders) may, it is true, be considerably developed without a *proportionate* development of

* *L'Angleterre et la Vie Anglaise*, vol. i. pp. 105–6.

the arms, but not without a *considerable* development of the arms. This disproportion may sometimes be observed in prize-fighters; but no one ever saw a prize-fighter without what would be called a good pair of arms. The blows are dealt by the action of the deltoids, but, both in hitting out and in parrying, there is considerable exercise for the arms themselves. And hence it is that a very powerful chest and very powerful shoulders are accompanied by at least moderately powerful arms.

Dr. Knox's statement is therefore at variance with itself; and it is at variance with other statements which he has made. If the Saxons are tall and athletic, it is rather difficult to believe that they are defective in their lower limbs. Difference of height depends generally upon different length of leg; and therefore, if the Saxon is tall, he must have the bones at least of his legs well developed, and if he is athletic, he must have the muscles of his legs well developed also; a prize-fighter, or a wrestler, knows well that his success depends quite as much upon his legs as upon his arms, or shoulders; and it is hardly necessary to say which limbs are most used in running or jumping.

It is amusing to find medical authority for the theory that an athlete is generally weak in the legs and arms. It is still more amusing to compare the two different theories advanced by two different writers in order to account for a peculiarity which probably has no existence, as a characteristic of race,

except in their own imaginations. Dr. Knox says * of the Saxon,—'Aware of his strength of chest and arms,† he uses them in self-defence;' and again, 'when young, they [the Saxons] cannot sit still an instant, so powerful is the desire for work, labour, excitement, muscular exertion.'‡ And Dr. Knox sees in the Saxon's huge chest the cause that impels him to use his fists; M. Esquiros sees in the Saxon's sedentary life the cause of his highly developed chest and arms; and both start with the assumption that an Englishman and a Saxon are nearly synonymous!

It may seem almost puerile to waste time in exposing such absurdities; but statements which circulate widely as facts cannot be ignored. Nor can the statement that the Saxon is large, while the Celt is small, be passed over without notice. Popular feeling in England is ready enough to adopt that statement, and to recognise the Frenchman as the typical Celt, the Englishman as the typical Saxon. M. Esquiros, however, more careful than Dr. Knox, has remarked on the great size of the Highlanders, in a passage already quoted.§ But it is not only in

* *The Race of Men*, p. 57.

† Here again Dr. Knox is hardly consistent with himself.

‡ *Ibid.* p. 54.

§ He speaks also of 'le haut de leurs jambes nu.'—*L'Angleterre et la Vie Angl.*, vol. i. p. 95. Prof. J. D. Forbes gives the following average measurements of men aged 25 :—

English.	Scotch.	Irish.
68·9 in.	69·3 in.	70·2 in.

Smibert's translation of Quêtelet, *Sur l'Homme*, p. 114. This average is, however, arrived at from a rather small number of instances.—See next chapter.

the Highlands that tall and powerful Celts are to be found. The Celts of Cornwall have made their stature, and their own particular 'hug,' famous wherever the sport of wrestling is known. The men of Cumberland, probably of hardly less pure Celtic blood than the men of Cornwall, are hardly less stalwart and brawny. And from those two counties come some of the finest, if not absolutely the finest, specimens of Englishmen. The athletic character of the English will be considered in the next chapter; in the meantime, it is enough to point out that the '*extreme rarity of athletæ*' among the Celts* is utterly disproved by the numbers of Irish prize-fighters, of Cornish wrestlers, and of Scotchmen 'who put the stone.'

So far, then, the evidence that we owe our stature exclusively to the Saxons has broken down. That the Saxons were large men is probable,—or rather it is probable that there were many large men among them. The Roman accounts of the *magni artus* and *immania corpora* of the Germans would lead us to that conclusion. But what was the stature of the ancient Britons? The passage which affords most information on this point is found in Strabo.†

* Some statistics bearing on this point will be given in the next chapter. M. Esquiros mentions as a characteristic of the Connemara peasantry, 'le développement des formes athlétiques.' —*L'Angleterre et la Vie Anglaise*, vol. i. p. 93.

† Book v. ch. 2.

He says they were taller than the Celts [Gauls], that their frames were looser, and not so well-knit,* that some British lads whom Strabo himself saw at Rome were excessively tall, and that they were knock-kneed.†

It would not be difficult to find in London, to-day, as many lads as might be required who would, in all respects, answer this description, and who would, with proper care, be, in ten years' time, as fine, straight, powerful fellows as any to be met with in the world. It is very curious to find Strabo giving the same description of the ancient Britons as that which Dr. Knox gives, in one respect, of the modern English. Both authors are rather unjust to the people whom they describe, because, while it is true that the frame of the Englishman is not always well-knit when young, it is not generally true that it never becomes well-knit at all. It is only by supposing that the English frame becomes more compact and symmetrical with years that we can explain two such directly contradictory statements as those of Dr. Knox and M. Esquiros.

We have, then, evidence that, before the Saxon invasion, the inhabitants of our island presented just the same prominent features which they present now; they were considerably taller than the inhabitants of Gaul, and they were not well-knit when young. The balance of evidence is already against

* χαυνότεροι τοῖς σώμασιν. † βλαισούς.

our descent from the Teutons if the Anglo-Saxons were true Germans.

Let us now consider the evidence of the human remains which have been discovered, and especially the evidence of the skulls. It might be reasonably expected that, here at least, there could be no difficulty—that a glance would suffice to tell us the characteristics of the ancient Britons, the Angles, and the Saxons. It so happens, however, that this evidence is most difficult to analyse, and appears, at first sight, the most conflicting of all. There are several theories to account for the facts, some of which theories were unfortunately in existence before the skulls were discovered. The theory most generally adopted is that which forces the skulls to conform to the conjecture of Lhuyd, that the Gaelic or Erse population preceded the Cymric. It is the theory of M. Thierry, and it is the theory of M. Edwards; it is a theory which attributes a short skull to the Erse or Gael, and a long skull to their successors. But, as Dr. Barnard Davis, and Dr. Thurnam, the authors of the 'Crania Britannica,' have pointed out, there is a difficulty which cannot, on this hypothesis, be easily surmounted. The evidence does not lead us to the conclusion that the short skulls preceded the long skulls in Britain. However ancient a number of British skulls may be, there are long skulls found among them; however recent, there are short skulls.

One at least of the authors of the 'Crania Britannica' has declared the typical ancient British skull to be brachycephalic,* while the advocates of Lhuyd's theory would gladly make it dolichocephalic.† The conclusion to which I have been led is that it was not exclusively brachycephalic or exclusively dolichocephalic, but that the two types co-existed. And this is a conclusion to which Dr. Davis seems to be not altogether averse, though even he would probably not admit that the evidence given by himself and his colleague tends to show that the prevailing type was dolichocephalic.

It is dangerous, perhaps it is hardly even generous, to use the labours of any authors against themselves. Still, the evidence given by Dr. Davis and Dr. Thurnam is so important that I cannot ignore it, while the conclusions of Dr. Thurnam are so at variance with the evidence that I cannot admit them. To begin with the pre-Roman period; the number of long skulls mentioned is greatly in excess of the number of short skulls mentioned. Thirty-five skulls are engraved, of which only sixteen are of the brachycephalic type. But in a table which appears at the end of the work the measurements are given of 111 British skulls, of which only thirty-six are of the brachycephalic type. The test of arithmetic very

* *i.e.* of a short oval or nearly round form.

† *i.e.* of a long oval form. The expressions brachycephalic skull and dolichocephalic skull are tautological, but they are universally used by the anatomists, and are, as technical terms, convenient.

soon shows that short skulls are scarce. Dr. Thurnam appends to his memoir 'On the Two Principal Forms of Ancient British and Gaulish Skulls' certain tables of measurements. There is a table giving the measurements of fifty ancient British skulls, twenty-five of which are from the round barrows, and are on the average decidedly brachycephalic, and twenty-five of which are from the long barrows, and are on the average decidedly dolichocephalic. There is also a table giving the measurements of fifty-six skulls (from the long barrows), which are on the average decidedly dolichocephalic, *but there is no corresponding table giving an equal number of brachycephalic skulls.**

But it is said that the long skulls are generally found in the oldest barrows, while the short skulls are found in the most recent barrows. Here again, I think, the evidence is insufficient. In the absence of evidence to the contrary, it is probable that the skulls which are plentiful, are more recent than the skulls which are scarce. Both flint and bronze implements are found in both kinds of barrows; in the long barrows, which contain the long heads, and in the short barrows, which contain the short heads. There are even exceptions to the rule that one type of head is found in one kind of barrow, another in another, exceptions which Dr. Thurnam is compelled to attribute to 'accident.' He might, I

* *Memoirs of the Anthropological Society of London*, vol. i. at the end.

think, have explained them more satisfactorily by his own experiences of the Gallic mounds. 'The chambered tumuli of France,' he says,* 'are not, as seems to be the case with those of England, exclusively, if even generally, the tombs of a dolichocephalic people. On the contrary, skulls extremely brachycephalous in form have been obtained from several of them.' From this statement two things are clear: we cannot accept the shape of the barrow as an index to race, and we must admit that the short-headed people were mixed with the long-headed people in Gaul at a very early period.

And with respect to England, Dr. Thurnam's colleague, Dr. Davis, seems to incline towards a hypothesis which appears to me unobjectionable, the hypothesis that the dolichocephalic people and the brachycephalic people have co-existed in this island from the earliest times of which any vestiges have been discovered. The relative numbers of the two peoples cannot, it appears to me, be determined from the scanty evidence of the barrows. We learn that there were long-headed men in by-gone times, and that there were short-headed men in by-gone times, but we do not learn that either type preceded or extirpated the other. We learn two great facts, but the minute details are left to conjecture. But if there has been anything like extirpation of one race by another, it has been the extirpation of the short-

* *Memoirs read before the Anthropological Society of London*, vol. i. p. 135.

-headed race by the long-headed race. The authors of the 'Crania Britannica' have mentioned more skulls found in Wiltshire than in any other county. The majority of the skulls are long, but instances of short skulls found in round barrows are not wanting. It is clear, then, that, if a short-headed race extirpated or partially extirpated a long-headed race in that county, the present inhabitants of Wiltshire should be short-headed, especially as we must suppose that there has since been a fresh admixture of short-headed Germans. But what are the facts? Wiltshire produces on the average *the longest heads found in any part of Europe.* Dr. Beddoe has discovered that in Wiltshire the ratio of breadth to length is as 76·56 to 100, while near Bremen it is as 79·83 to 100.*

Another very important point is that almost all the British skulls found in and near Wiltshire—near Abury and Stonehenge †—are of the dolichocephalic form. This fact gives us some reason to suspect that the dominant people—the people who had skill and labour at command—were dolichocephalic. We are

* Paper presented to the Anthropological Society of London, but not yet published, *On the Head-forms of the West of England.* It should, however, be remarked that the number observed was of Bremen heads only seven, of Wiltshire heads fifty. But ample evidence of the shortness of the German heads will be found in this chapter.

† I commit myself to no opinion respecting the origin of the stone-circles found at those places, except that it must have been pre-Roman—an opinion which, I think, I am justified in holding until it can be shown that either the Romans or their Teutonic successors were in the habit of using stones in a similar manner in other parts of the world.

not without stronger evidence that the Cymric head is long.

'It has been already pointed out,' says Retzius,* 'in several places in Prichard's works that the Celts † had long, and often very low and narrow, brain-cases. More recent observations made by myself, Nilsson, and others, on a great number of individuals, and of skulls belonging to the Celtic stock, have confirmed that opinion. As an additional testimony in favour of this view may be also mentioned the numerous skulls of oval form, with the long *occiput*, which have been collected from the most ancient burying-places in Denmark,‡ and which were exhibited in the rich Museum of Northern Antiquities, at Copenhagen, at the meeting of naturalists in the year 1847. These skulls were almost unanimously considered to have belonged to the Celts of the North, the Cimbri. I have since had opportunities of examining other ancient skulls from Sweden as well as from Öland, and I have become more and more convinced that they have belonged to the Cimbri, who certainly

* *Ethnologische Schriften*, p. 102.

† Rather the Cymry, as will presently appear.

‡ Some anatomists assert that the modern Scandinavian head is long; and to that assertion Professor Huxley gives the weight of his name. It is very probable that the old Cimbrian stock has handed down some of its characteristics, and that the Scandinavians have not been completely Teutonised. But if Worsaae's statement, that the East Yorkshiremen are in all respects like the Danes, be correct, the Danish skull holds an intermediate position between that of the German and that of the ordinary Southern Englishman.

dwelt in our country in no inconsiderable numbers.' *

The evidence for attributing a long skull to the Cymry is now very strong; and it is evidence of very great importance in tracing the ancestry of the long-skulled English. Some proof, however, it may be said, should be given that the people calling themselves Cymry at the present time have the characteristics of these Cymry of the past. But it must be remembered that I do not use the word Cymry as a synonyme for Welsh. I use it as a convenient term to designate a people possessing certain characteristics, and I use it in preference to any other term, because it serves to identify the possessors of those characteristics at widely different times and in widely different districts. In Wales there are many types of head, perhaps more than in England; but as in England so in Wales the Cymric type is to be found, though, unless I am mistaken, it is less generally diffused throughout Wales than throughout England. There is, however, no doubt that it may be found in all parts of the principality; and in South Wales it is the prevailing type.†

But the evidence afforded by the skulls found in Anglo-Saxon burying-places must now be con-

* Retzius was a Swede.

† Dr. Beddoe found that in 46 heads from South Wales the average ratio of breadth to length was as 77·5 to 100.—*On the Head-forms of the West of England.*

sidered. They may, as Dr. Davis has remarked, be divided into two groups, the broad and flat on the one hand, the arched and long on the other. Dr. Davis further tells us that the broad skulls have an affinity to the skulls of the modern Germans. It is therefore probable that they may really have belonged to the Anglo-Saxons. But it cannot be so readily admitted that the longer skulls belonged to the Anglo-Saxons of pure breed. Many of them are the skulls of women, who may have been the British wives of Saxon settlers. Without confirmatory evidence of some kind, it cannot be allowed that a skull found in an Anglo-Saxon burying-place is the skull of an Anglo-Saxon of pure blood. If any of the Britons became Saxonised, there might be found not only the remains of the half-breeds but the remains of the Britons themselves in the Saxon tombs. Dr Thurnam has himself admitted the possibility of half-blood in his remarks on a skull found in an Anglo-Saxon cemetery at Fairford (Gloucestershire).

Could it be shown that the skulls found in the Anglo-Saxon burying-places differed from the ancient British skulls in certain characteristics, and also conformed in those same characteristics to the skulls of the modern dwellers in the old Anglo-Saxon home, the evidence would indeed be conclusive. But, on the contrary, although there are some skulls found which do conform to the North Germanic type, the greater number differ from that type in nearly the

same points in which many ancient British skulls differ from it. The authors of the 'Crania Britannica' frequently remind us that the ordinary modern English skull is very like the ordinary oviform skulls of the Saxon burying-places. But a similar form of skull* existed in Britain long before the Saxon period; and, moreover, this form of skull is not characteristic of any modern Germanic people. It would be difficult to prove from these premises that the English are the descendants of the Anglo-Saxons, if the Anglo-Saxons were Teutons.

Several instances are given in the 'Crania Britannica' of skulls supposed to be Roman. They are all of nearly the same form—square, rather broad, and flat. Sandifort† describes a Roman skull found at Pompeii, the characteristics of which agree in the main‡ with those described in the 'Crania Britannica:'

* The authors of the *Crania Britannica* remark of a skull found with flint implements in Wetton Hill Barrow, in Staffordshire, that it presents few of the harsh peculiarities of the ancient British race; 'on the contrary, there is about it an air of slenderness and refinement. In some features *it assimilates to the modern English cranium*, although decidedly narrower, whilst its genuine and remote antiquity is determined by unquestionable evidence.' The 'harsh peculiarities' of the British race have not yet disappeared, as any one may see who examines the skulls of British soldiers in the Museum of the Military Hospital at Netley.

† In his *Tabulæ Craniorum*. Fascic. i.

‡ Sandifort's specimen seems, however, to have been exceptionally long. 'Conceptaculum cerebri,' he says, 'oblongam habet formam.' But all the other characteristics are quite different from those of the English.

'Frons lata et complanata, in linea perpendiculari adscendit; hinc vertex etiam complanatus, nec nisi in posteriore parte parum adscendit . . . . Facies est lata et complanata.' These descriptions, coupled with the fact that most modern Italian heads are broad in proportion to their length, perhaps justify us in denying that there is any considerable Roman element in our population.

It is now necessary to state what grounds we have for the assertion that the typical English head is remarkable for its length, while the typical German head is remarkable for its breadth. It was no easy task to arrive at a satisfactory conclusion.

Anatomists do not always agree with one another —are not even always consistent with themselves. And this is not to be wondered at when it is known that Blumenbach,* who has been considered one of the greatest authorities on the subject of craniology, thought that the cranial characteristics of all the human varieties could be determined by the examination of less than 200 skulls. Even Retzius does not give us anything more definite than the experience 'einer Menge von Individuen and Schädeln,' while Sandifort, like Blumenbach, seems to be almost utterly deficient in the power of setting a fair value upon evidence.

Before the generalisations of the craniologists could

* *Decas Sexta Craniorum*, p. 6.

be made use of, it was therefore found necessary to ascertain how far they were supported by a considerably greater number of instances than had in most cases sufficed to convince the various authors. This, it was thought, could best be done with the assistance of the hatters.* In some cases it was found that their experience confirmed the statements of the anatomists,—in others not; and even the hatters, like the anatomists, sometimes differed among themselves. But, on some of the most important points, there is an agreement between all the anatomists and all the hatters; and those points may be considered satisfactorily established.

In the first place it is established, beyond all dispute, that the average English head is considerably longer in proportion to its breadth than the average German, French, or Italian heads; and when the English head varies from the ordinary shape, it usually becomes still longer rather than broader.

The evidence which bears upon the Northern German heads is very conclusive. Retzius speaks of a skull, supposed to be Saxon, which is said to possess all the characteristics of the Germanic people, and which 'is of a rounded form.'† He says further, 'I have recently obtained more skulls from Germany and Holland, all of this form, which very nearly

* I am especially indebted to Messrs. Lincoln and Bennett, and Messrs. Baumann.

† *Ethnologische Schriften*, p. 110.

approaches that of the Swedes and Goths.' * * And in still more unmistakable language he says †:—

'During my stay in France and England, I had an opportunity of acquainting myself with the forms which characterise the skulls of the inhabitants of those countries. I found the following three forms common to both countries, but in different proportions:—

'1. The round form, which has its seats in the South of France, and some parts of Scotland and Ireland. I consider therefore that this form is derived from the ancient Iberians.

'2. A long oval form—the true Celtic.

'3. A shorter oval form, with the sides more arched, which is Norman, and is closely allied to the German.'

The statement of Retzius, that the German head is arched, is not easily to be reconciled with the statement found in the 'Crania Britannica,' that the Germans are platycephalic. But if we attend simply to the proportions of length and breadth, all the anatomists seem to be agreed that the average German head is shorter in proportion to its length than the average English head. And the hatters also are unanimous; they find that the longitudinal diameter is, in ordinary Southern English heads, usually 1½ inches greater than the transverse diameter, in the Yorkshire heads

* *Ethnologische Schriften*, p. 411. † *Ibid.* p. 64.

1¼ inches, in German heads barely 1 inch.* Our relationship with the modern Germans seems therefore, upon the testimony of physical characteristics, to be at least as remote as our relationship with any other European people. The long oval heads most certainly were common in Britain before the invasion of the Saxons, or of the Romans, and they most certainly are not common among the Northern Germans † of the present day. All the evidence, without exception, points to the Cymry as the progenitors of those English people who possess the longer oval skull, and who constitute the bulk of the nation. Dr. Beddoe, Dr. Retzius, M. Edwards, Dr. Broca, the authors of

* It should be remarked that, where there is an unusual development of the superciliary ridges, there is no corresponding sign in the size of the hat, which does not come so far down on the forehead. But, for the purposes of general classification, the unanimous testimony of anatomists and hatters is irresistible.

† English hatters, when exporting hats to Holland, 'set them rounder than for the English market.' But one of the anatomists tells a different story. Professor Karl Vogt speaks of the extreme length of the Dutch head. It is possible, therefore, though Professor Vogt's statements are often rash, that both types exist in Holland, and that the prevailing Teutonic form is found side by side with the Belgic or Cymric form.

Since this portion of the essay was written, there has appeared in the *Anthropological Review* (vol. iii. pp. 52-84) an excellent paper by Professor Wilson, of Toronto, *On the Physical Characteristics of the Ancient and Modern Celt.* He, too, has derived much of his information from hatters. It fully confirms all that has been above stated with respect to the difference between English and German heads. The facts which Prof. Wilson has collected are the more valuable as they have been obtained from wholly independent sources, some of them from the other side of the Atlantic.

the 'Crania Britannica,' and last, but not least, the hatters, suggest, when their evidence is compared, only that one conclusion.

There is, however, one other possible explanation which should not be lost sight of. The Jutes, Angles, Saxons, and Danes, came from those countries which had previously been possessed by the Cymry; and it is not impossible that there was among them a considerable intermixture of Cymric blood. Be that as it may, it is certainly to one branch of the Cymric stock that we owe the chief characteristic of our English heads. Those heads are, it is true, not *quite* so narrow; they are generally far better developed than most of the ancient dolichocephalic British skulls; but still the Cymric type * is that to which they most nearly conform. And if, as is probable, the slight increase of breadth has been caused by an admixture of non-Cymric blood, it is still probable that the admixture is not exclusively Teutonic. The brachycephalic people who in part occupied the island before, or contemporaneously with, the true Cymry have probably in the lapse of centuries become more thoroughly intermixed with the whole population. In this way we may account for the great height which characterises the majority of English skulls. I have ascertained, from personal observation, that many of the North Welsh have short oval skulls, with remarkably high foreheads.

* By which, I must again remark, I do not mean Welsh type, as there are several types in Wales,

Their ancestors may, perhaps, have contributed a little to our modern English stock. If so, there remains not much in the average English skull that the often platycephalic Teuton can claim for his own.

An attempt, it will be remembered, was made, in the preceding chapter, to show that a *primâ facie* case existed for a comparison of the ancient Greeks with the Cymry. It was found that certain coincidences existed in the languages, the pronunciation, and the traditions, of those two peoples—coincidences worth little, perhaps, when considered separately, but worthy of notice when considered in combination. A comparison of physical characteristics may help to determine whether those coincidences are due to a real community of blood.

The Cymric head is, according to all the evidence, of a long oval form; but there have been found, though in far smaller numbers, in ancient British burying-places skulls of the short oval form. What if we find precisely the same phenomena in ancient Greece? What if we find just these two forms of skulls idealised in the ancient Greek sculptures? Will not the triple coincidence of language, tradition, and skull-types, serve to establish that which might remain doubtful if we had only the double coincidence to depend upon?

Retzius has pointed out* that the Farnese

* *Ethnologische Schriften*, p. 88.

Hercules exhibits the brachycephalic form of skull, very much shortened behind. And he adds, 'The Apollo Belvedere is universally cited as a model of beautiful Greek form. It is, in the highest degree, remarkable that this statue presents a totally different skull-form from that above mentioned; it is oval with the occiput prominent.'* Thus it will be seen that the form which the Greek sculptors loved to idealise as the type of beauty was that of the long oval Cymric head—a fact hardly to be reconciled with any other supposition than that such heads, more or less well-developed, were constantly before the sculptors' eyes.

But in Greek sculpture the short form of head is by no means so common as the long. The Ephebi on the frieze of the Parthenon belong, almost without exception, to one well-marked type. Their heads show length in the occiputs, and height above and behind the ears. It is, of course, impossible to ascertain the ratio of breadth to length in heads seen only in profile; but the profile is sufficient to establish the type of which the other characteristics are known, and which appears commonly in the busts of

* This word is used as the nearest equivalent for the German *vorspringendem*; but the epithet, when applied to the back of the head, produces something very like a 'bull.' The length of the occiput is, however, a very marked feature in many, perhaps in the majority of, English heads. I ought perhaps to remark that the Apollo Belvedere is possibly the work of some artist who lived in Italy under the Empire; but the statement of Retzius will apply equally well to the genuine Greek Apollos.

Hermes and Apollo. I do not conceal from myself the fact that there are very grave objections against an ethnological argument based on ideal representations in which the conventionalities of art are plainly discernible. Why, for instance, it might be urged, may we not maintain that in the ordinary Greek face the line of the forehead, when viewed in profile, appeared to be a continuation, in the same straight line, of the line of the nose? This peculiarity is even more constant in Greek sculpture than the Cymric type of head. To this question, I think, it may be fairly answered that, when a carefully finished artistic representation is found to conform to a natural type, it is more reasonable to attribute the agreement to design than to chance. The general type of head is found in nature, and is characteristic of a people; the particular line of the forehead, if found in nature at all, is excessively rare, and not characteristic.

Another objection, which naturally presents itself, is that, even if these Greek heads are idealisations of living forms, the models may have been not Greeks, but foreigners. But this is in the highest degree improbable; the Greeks had more self-esteem than perhaps any people except the English; in their eyes nothing that was not Greek was good; they would then hardly have elevated a barbarian into a God.

It might be supposed that the busts of great Greeks which have been handed down to us would throw some light upon this question. Unfortunately they are almost all of the Roman period; and even if

original portraits live again in these copies, they probably live only in copies of copies. We cannot tell how far each copyist deviated from his original; we cannot tell how far a Greco-Roman artist might, by a subtle flattery, have transformed a Mæcenas into a Plato, or a Thucydides into a Mæcenas. We can, however, be tolerably sure that the majority of these busts were intended only to give an idea of the face, and that in most instances the back of the head is very roughly finished. So little attention was it thought necessary to give to this portion of the bust that in many instances we see two Greeks sculptured back to back, in such a position that, had they sat for their portraits, the occiput of each must have been cut off, and the front part of each head glued on to the front part of its companion-head. These portraits then are ethnologically useless.

But the genuine Greek ideal heads are valuable, not only because we know, in some cases at least, the date of their execution, not only because we see that they have their prototypes in nature, but because skulls which might have served as models for them are actually found in ancient Greek graves. Those anatomists who have touched upon the subject are singularly unanimous in declaring the ancient Greek skulls to be generally of the long oval form.*

* I must, however, confess that I doubt whether there is sufficient anatomical evidence to establish the prevailing ancient Greek type. I have myself inspected and measured the Greek skulls in Netley Hospital, and found considerable diversity among them. The difficulty of forming a conclusion is increased by the want of

Professor Owen* has remarked of a skull of that type found in Caithness that it has a resemblance to the skulls of the Greeks. Retzius, as we have already seen, identified the head of the Apollo with the Cymric type. And Dr. Barnard Davis assures me that he has in his collection an ancient Athenian skull of undoubted authenticity in which the ratio of the breadth to the length is only as 72 to 100.

But there are some few portraits of Greeks on coins and elsewhere which there is reason to regard as authentic.† And these few throw, I think, some light on the ideal Greek face. They have generally long noses, not straight, like the rarely seen ideal nose, but sinuous. The tip is prominent; above it there is a depression; above that depression again a promi-

clearness in the catalogue made by the late Dr. Williamson. He says the collection consists of eighteen ancient and eight modern skulls; but of these twenty-six, only two are distinctly stated to be modern, only seven are distinctly stated to be ancient, and of the remainder only two can be with certainty pronounced modern. It so happens that of the seven decidedly ancient skulls, six are dolichocephalic. Of the remaining fifteen two are imperfect; and of the thirteen still left, four are dolichocephalic, nine brachycephalic. If it be assumed that the four modern skulls still undetermined are likely to be brachycephalic in the same proportion as the nine ancient skulls still undetermined, it will be seen that the ancient skulls are almost equally divided between the two classes, though the dolichocephalic slightly preponderate. The scanty anatomical evidence, then, I think, proves no more than that the type which I have called 'Cymric' existed among the ancient Greeks. The Greek works of art prove at least that it was in good repute; and we may fairly infer that the ordinary Greek was the model for the ordinary Ephebus of the sculptors.

* *Journal Anthrop. Soc. Lond.* vol. iii. p. xxxix.

† *See* the plates in Visconti's *Iconographie Grecque.*

nence; between that prominence and the forehead again a depression. Soften down these inequalities, and you have the ideal Greek nose. This sinuous nose it is the fashion among anatomists to call Celtic; but I believe it might, with at least equal justice, be called English. Among all the varieties of noses I doubt whether there is any which is more abundant than this sinuous form in England or even in Wales.

Let any one now go to the British Museum, and, if I may use the expression, de-idealise the ideal Greek heads of the sculptures. Let him, in his mind's eye, convert the long straight nose into the long sinuous nose; let him destroy the straight line presented in nose and forehead by elevating the line of the forehead to an angle with the line of the nose; and let him then consider well the heads and the faces which he has before him. Let him look well at the plates in the 'Iconographie Grecque,' marking how Greek types agree, though the artist's birth-place may differ. Let him realise to himself the general identity of the elements of Greek nationality even in different localities. Let him de-idealise the engravings, where necessary, as he de-idealised the sculptures; and then let him ask himself in what European city he thinks he might with most success look for models for these works of art or for the originals of these portraits. In Berlin or any of the German capitals? No; he would find short heads there, and short noses too, for the most part, flattened down on

the face, and with wide open nostrils. In Paris? No; but with more success than in Berlin. In London? Yes, even in the lowest haunts of the lowest neighbourhoods. The head-type he will find there to be almost universal, the nose-type, though not universal, nor even predominant, still very common.

The conclusions here suggested will be confirmed when the sports of the ancient Britons, ancient Greeks, and modern English are compared. That comparison it will be most convenient to make in the next chapter. In this chapter an attempt has been made to determine, in the case of each people, and to compare together those characteristics which may appear both in the living and in the dead. In the next chapter an attempt will be made to determine and compare those characteristics which are manifested only in the living, feeling, acting, thinking, human being.

CHAPTER IV.

THE EVIDENCE OF PSYCHICAL CHARACTERISTICS.

Necessity for a good division and classification of psychical phenomena—That of Professor Bain the simplest, and therefore best adapted to our purpose — The athletic character of the English—Their extraordinary will and energy traceable to a pre-Teutonic rather than a Teutonic source—Manifestation of the same characteristics by the ancient Greeks—Wonder, the characteristic emotion of the Germans, not of the English—The sense of decency in England and abroad—Patriotism in the English and in foreigners—Resemblance of the Druidic philosophy to some forms of Greek philosophy—Eloquence of Britons, Greeks, and English —Constructive powers in Greeks, Britons, Germans, and English, as shown especially in mechanical skill and inventions, in the drama, in architecture, in music, and in painting—The power of detecting hidden resemblances and the power of retaining past impressions, as shown especially in the poetry, the philosophy, and the science of Greece, Germany, and England—Certain moral characteristics corresponding to the intellectual characteristics—General agreement of the Greek character with the English, and with what is known of the ancient British character.

A SYSTEMATIC comparison of the psychical characteristics of different nations is a task of such difficulty that anyone who attempts it may reasonably claim some indulgence for his shortcomings. An attempt to make such a comparison leads us into a field which has hitherto been almost untrodden. A few hasty

generalisations upon the impulsiveness of the Celt and the steadiness of the Teuton, a dogma or two on the subject of art from some critics who assume to themselves infallibility in matters of taste, and a compliment from each particular author to his own nation, or to his own particular province, may be considered the sum total of all that has been written on the subject. This meagreness in a branch of ethnology, which is perhaps the most important of all, is due probably to the unsatisfactory state in which psychology has remained for ages, and to the facility which, as a necessary consequence, exists, of exaggerating any salient feature, of seeing a salient feature where none has been planted by nature. Different psychologists have given different divisions and different subdivisions of the mind; and of those writers who have glanced at the mental peculiarities of different nations or peoples, some have adopted one division, some another, some apparently no division at all. No wonder, then, if statements directly opposed to each other are found in works written by authors of repute, no wonder if the whole question is in the greatest confusion.

The first object of search in the consideration of psychical characteristics is therefore a satisfactory division and classification of mental phenomena. When this is obtained, one source at least of error is cut off. And of all the divisions and classifications of the mind which have hitherto been made, Professor Bain's is perhaps the best for our purpose: the

best by reason of its comprehensiveness, and the best by reason of its simplicity. It may be admitted that even this division is open to objections, but it is open to fewer objections than any other, and it will, in the main, be adopted in the present investigation. It will be necessary to state briefly the leading principles of classification.

The primary division is fourfold—into the Senses, the Intellect, the Emotions, and the Will. Before dealing with the senses, however, Professor Bain assigns to the muscular feelings a province of their own; principally because he is anxious to establish a theory of spontaneous activity, which it is unnecessary to discuss here. There may, however, be suggested another reason for considering the muscular feelings and movements as a distinct branch of enquiry, and that is their very great importance as an index to character and disposition.*

The intellect is treated under three different heads:—

1. The power of retaining and reviving past impressions, the various component parts of which are associated, when revived, as they were associated when first received.

2. The power of perceiving resemblances; of recalling past impressions by the aid of present impressions which have some point or points of resemblance to those past impressions.

* *See* an essay, by the author, '*On Physical Education*,' Longmans, 1863.

3. The power of original construction—of combination.

To use Professor Bain's own words, we have first the Law of Contiguity or Adhesiveness, or, as it was called by Sir William Hamilton, the Law of Redintegration :—' Actions, Sensations, and States of Feeling, occurring together, or in close succession, tend to grow together, or cohere, in such a way that, when any one of them is afterwards presented to the mind, the others are apt to be brought up in idea.' *

We have, secondly, the 'Law of Similarity:' '*Present* Actions, Sensations, Thoughts, or Emotions, tend to revive their LIKE among *previous* impressions or states.' †

We have, thirdly, the principle of Constructive Association : ' By means of Association, the mind has the power to form combinations or aggregates different from any that have been presented to it in the course of experience.' ‡

Great observers and collectors of facts are strong in the element of Contiguity. Great thinkers, men who generalise and discover laws—are strong in the element of 'Similarity.' § Great inventors are strong in the element of Constructive Association ; such men are poets, painters, musical composers, inventors in the arts and sciences.

* *The Senses and the Intellect*, 2nd ed. p. 332.

† *Ibid.* p. 463.

‡ *Ibid.* p. 585.

§ Used in a technical signification for the power of detecting resemblances.

Under the head of Similarity fall the reasoning processes to which have been given the names of Generalisation, Abstraction, Induction, Deduction, &c.

The great value of this division consists above all in its simplicity; it enables us to class together mental operations which appear, at first sight, quite distinct, but are really almost identical. It renders possible, what without such a classification is impossible, the comparison in different nations of mental qualities which are in fact identical, though they are seen in different aspects. This will be shown as the argument advances.

It is not necessary to say much of Professor Bain's treatment of the Emotions and the Will, though references will be occasionally made to it; it is to his work on the Senses and the Intellect that I am most indebted, and especially to his subdivisions of the intellect.

A number of arguments have been adduced in the two preceding chapters to show that the ancient Greeks and the ancient Britons had much in common —that there were common elements in the populations of the two countries. Those arguments were used with the view of obtaining some better insight into the psychical characteristics and capabilities of the ancient British people than could be obtained from evidence bearing solely upon the inhabitants of this island. In the present chapter, the psychical characteristics of the three nations—the ancient

Britons, the ancient Greeks, and the English—will be compared together, and will be compared with the psychical characteristics of the Teutonic peoples, from whom it has been supposed that the English are descended. In this way, the bond between the ancient Britons and the ancient Greeks will be drawn still closer; and it will be shown that a strong resemblance exists between the English and the ancient Britons, but that a still stronger resemblance may be detected between the more developed Greeks and the English, who are developed most of all. In short, the ancient British peculiarities will be traced by comparison to their higher development in the ancient Greeks, and thence by comparison to their highest development in the modern English.

It will, perhaps, be best to begin with the simplest manifestations of disposition, with those which there will be least difficulty in identifying in the different nations compared. It may be considered somewhat bold to assert that the athletic characteristics of the English people may be traced to a Celtic rather than a Saxon source. It is not only Dr. Knox who holds that the Saxon is the greatest athlete; the strength and endurance of the 'Anglo-Saxon race' are proverbial. Let us now consider, calmly what is the evidence in favour of this theory. And let us first consider what are the principal forms in which the athletic power of the English displays itself.

The English and Irish are probably the best horse-

men in Europe; it would be difficult even to discover in any European language an equivalent for 'across country;' and when foreign nations adopt our national sport of horseracing, the horses are almost without exception of English pedigree, the jockeys are without exception of English or Irish birth.

Cricket is a game which is essentially English, though it is not unknown in Ireland.

The English, again, are the best oarsmen in the world, whether amateurs or professed watermen. A race between an English crew and a foreign crew almost invariably leaves the latter 'nowhere.'

Skating is a pastime which we share with the French, the Dutch, the Germans, and others; but although the opportunities for practice in England are far inferior to those which are enjoyed in other countries, it is in England that the art has attained its highest perfection.* A Dutchman may attain extraordinary speed, and a Frenchman may accomplish wonderful *tours de force* with the knees bent; but it is the Englishman who, *par excellence*, attains that perfect command over all his movements, which is shown by the deliberate 'three,' the straight leg, and the wide sweep.

It is England which is famous for its prize-ring. We are not at present concerned with the merits or demerits of that institution, but simply with the fact

* So far at least as Europe is concerned. The Canadians, who have much greater advantages, are at least our equals.

that it has long been and still is one of our national peculiarities.

The English are great wrestlers too; for the prize-fighter must be prepared to 'close,' and to be closed with; and among the wrestlers the greatest are the men of Cornwall and Cumberland.

And, in addition to all this, the gymnasium and the school of arms are not unknown among us.

It is, then, not without reason that we are considered an athletic people. The great variety of our athletic sports may certainly be allowed to carry off the palm—notwithstanding the sword-practice of France and Italy, and the gymnastic feats of the Germans.

Too little is known of the manners and customs of the ancient Britons to enable us to bring direct testimony that they were a remarkably athletic people; nor, on the other hand, are we able to assert or deny, from direct testimony, that the ancient Germans were an athletic people.* But, nevertheless, there exists evidence to show whence our athletic spirit is sprung. The evidence of philology, though it is frequently of little value, is sometimes sufficient to establish a particular point.

It was remarked in the second chapter of this essay that the Welsh word *ymafael*† (wrestling) must be compared with the Greek πάλη, συμπαλαίω,

* It must be remembered that 'athletic' and 'warlike' are not synonymous terms; the athlete may be, and frequently is, simply a sportsman. But see Tacitus, *Germ.* 15, and Cæsar *de Bell. Gall.* vi. 21.

† *See*, for answer to objections, *ante* p. 117.

ym having a signification nearly equivalent to the Greek σύν or ἅμα. It is certainly little short of the marvellous that in two languages, in which even the names of the metals are different, the name of an athletic sport has remained the same. We might almost conjecture that the sport and the language belonged to Greeks and Britons—or rather their common ancestors—before either knew the use of the metals. And it is very curious that wrestling is one of the athletic sports in which the Greeks most excelled, and in which the English—especially the men of Cornwall and Cumberland—most excel at the present day.

Language will not equally enable us to trace the use of the fists to the ancient Britons; but, bearing in mind the connexion which has been pointed out between the Britons and the Greeks, we may reasonably suspect a British origin for a custom which was held in honour among the ancient Greeks, and is in disrepute among the Germans. There is a savour of slang about the Homeric expression πὺξ ἀγαθός, which could not even be rendered into German, but which the editor of 'Bell's Life' would have no difficulty in translating 'a good one with the mawleys.'

But while there is no evidence that the use of the fists is of Teutonic origin, or is in any way congenial to the Teutonic character, the suspicion that the custom is of Celtic origin is at once confirmed by a reference to the annals of the ring.* It is

* *Fistiana*, 1865, and the *Illustrated Boxiana*.

unfortunate that the birthplaces of the prize-fighters have not been made known in the majority of instances. But the birthplaces of more than seven hundred are known, and the evidence afforded by them is not only quite consistent with a Celtic origin of the custom but is quite inconsistent with a Teutonic origin. It is obvious that, if any portion of South Britain was thoroughly Teutonised by the Anglo-Saxon invaders, it must have been that which lies nearest to the eastern coast; and if the love of fighting with the fists (which is always considered peculiarly English) be really an Anglo-Saxon characteristic, it is obvious that the majority of the prize-fighters should be natives of the easternmost part of the island, while few, if any, should come from the west. But what are the facts? Of all the counties on the eastern and south-eastern coasts there are only two which produce even a moderate number of pugilists. Of these two, that which produces the larger number (fifty-seven) is Yorkshire—a county which, though extending on one side to the eastern coast, extends on the other more than three-quarters of the distance to the western coast. And the largest contributions to this total of fifty-seven are made by the towns of Sheffield and Leeds, which send respectively seventeen and fourteen. Both these towns lie about half-way between the easternmost and westernmost extremities of the county. With the exception of ten contributed by Hull, the remainder of the Yorkshire fighters, whose birthplaces are known, come from the manu-

facturing towns of the west. Norfolk is the only other county on the eastern or south-eastern coasts which boasts a larger number than nine; and of the eighteen Norfolk prize-fighters, fourteen are Norwich men, one a Lynn man, and one a Yarmouth man; from which facts it may be conjectured that the men who make voyages to those places and to Hull bring with them some blood of which the elements are not in the same proportions as in the natives of the coast.

But the great bulk of the English fighting-men come from the western and the midland districts. Lancashire contributes 92, Staffordshire 66, Warwickshire 118, Somerset 27, Notts 22. The metropolitan counties, Middlesex, Surrey, Essex, and Kent, which may perhaps be fairly considered to represent the whole nation, contribute 105, while Birmingham alone boasts 103.

But it must not be forgotten that other causes, besides difference of blood, may have some influence in causing the difference between different districts. It appears that, even in the same county, the great manufacturing towns produce large numbers of prize-fighters, while the mere county-towns and the agricultural districts produce few or none. Manchester, for instance, produces 32, while Lancaster produces only one, Walsall 22, and Stafford none, Birmingham 103, and Warwick none. But what connexion, it may be asked, can exist between manufactures and prize-fighting? The answer is probably to be found in the following considerations:

where large bodies of men congregate, there is a greater probability of quarrels than in thinly-peopled districts; that portion of the population which possesses the greatest energy and vitality is most likely to seek its fortunes in the manufacturing centres, where most money is to be made; the town populations are generally less Teutonic than those of the rural districts; and there is a very considerable immigration of Irish into all the manufacturing towns. It is indeed probable that there are and have been quite as many fighters of Irish as of English blood; for, although this is not apparent from the direct information given in 'Fistiana,' the names of the pugilists indicate that in many instances they are of Irish descent, if not of Irish birth.

Whether the use of the fists be a good thing or not, no one will deny that it is characteristically English; and the evidence which has now been given, meagre * though it certainly is, shows, I venture to

* In a paper read by the late Professor J. D. Forbes before the Royal Society of Edinburgh, and afterwards printed in Smibert's translation of Quêtelet, *Sur l'Homme*, p. 114, some figures are given, which, as far as they go, seem also to indicate that the infusion of Saxon blood into British veins has decreased rather than increased the original vigour of the Celt, though not to any great extent. But M. Quêtelet, who was the first great experimenter with the dynamometer, has pointed out, in his work, *Sur l'Homme*, that, unless the utmost care is used, the result cannot be relied on, and that different observers arrive at totally different conclusions. It must be remembered, too, that Forbes made experiments only on 178 English, 523 Scotch, and 72 Irish of all ages between 14 and 25, and that therefore the average numbers at each age would be (fractions apart) 15 English, 44 Scotch,

believe, with more clearness than is generally to be obtained in ethnological matters, that at least one marked feature of the English character is to be traced to a pre-Teutonic origin.

Moreover, the south-west of England produces not only wrestlers and pugilists but excellent sailors; tall muscular men, who add not a little to the strength of our navy. These sailors, whose homes are on the coast between Bristol and Portsmouth, have been famous from the time when the New World was discovered until now.

The Greeks, too, like the English, were not only great pugilists but great oarsmen; and there does not perhaps exist any more striking evidence of the Athenian character than the sudden change of feeling which decreed life to a number of human beings condemned to death, and nerved a gallant crew to exertions almost more than human in behalf of captive foes.*

and 6 Irish; and as the results are not the same at all ages, it is clear that the result for the age of 25, on which Forbes places most reliance, and which has been most frequently quoted, is of no very great scientific value. Forbes accepted Quêtelet's numbers for the Belgians, and the very great apparent difference between their strength and that of the English, Scotch, and Irish, is probably owing chiefly to a different method of using the dynamometer. It is nevertheless curious that Forbes's numbers confirm the conclusion arrived at from my analysis of *Fistiana*.

	English.	Scotch.	Irish.	Belgians.
Strength in pounds at the age of 25 according to Regnier's dynamometer	403	423	432.	339.

* The Athenians condemned the prisoners taken at Mitylene to death, but the next day reversed the decree; and the boat which carried the reprieve arrived just in time to prevent the execution of the sentence.

But, above all, the Greeks were celebrated, just as the English are celebrated, for their horseraces. And here again is a connecting link between the Greeks and the Britons. The Greeks had not what we Englishmen understand by horseraces, but chariot-races, which probably owed their origin to the ancient custom of fighting from chariots. This custom, common to the early Greeks with many eastern nations, was shared also by the Britons, and apparently, among western nations, by the Britons only.* Just as there was a type of language common to Greeks and Britons, there was a mode of warfare common to both; and in the latter case at least the similarity does not appear to have been shared by the nations lying between Britain and Greece.

But there is direct evidence to show that, even in the time of the Romans, Britain was a great hunting-country. The chase of the boar has now, it is true, been succeeded by the chase of the fox; but coursing and stag-hunting seem to be the lineal descendants of ancient British sports. Mr. Wright, who has been indefatigable in this field of enquiry, has called attention † to the evidence that boar-hunting was a common sport in the Roman period. He has shown

* For evidence that the Greeks, at an early period, used war-chariots, *see* Homer's *Iliad* passim; for evidence that other eastern nations used them, *see* the *Old Testament*; for evidence that the Britons used them, *see Cæsar*, De Bell. Gall. lib. iv. c. 33.

† *The Celt, the Roman, and the Saxon*, pp. 210 and 214.

that hunting-scenes are commonly depicted on the pottery of that period, the hare or the stag being generally the victims; he has pointed out the ancestors of our English bull-dogs, mastiffs, greyhounds, and staghounds, whose portraits were painted before the Saxons were heard of; and, above all, he has pointed out that these dogs were of British, not of Roman, origin. There is, too, a curious passage in the laws of Ine which shows that the head-groom and horse-messenger of the king of the West Saxons was commonly a Wealh, *i.e.* not what we understand by a Welshman, but one of the conquered Britons. From this we may infer whence came the 'horsey' tendencies of the English, just as from the fact that Imperial grooms and most jockeys in France are Englishmen we may infer whence came the 'horsey' tendencies of the French. The royal Horse-Wealh, too, was a person of some consequence among the West Saxons. These people, like all the Teutonic nations, had a droll custom of setting a value in money upon all human lives. A British slave was worth only sixty shillings; a Briton who had a hide of land was worth only a hundred and twenty, but the king's Horse-Wealh was worth two hundred.*

These facts are of no slight importance when it is remembered that we are emphatically a hunting

* *See*, for these facts, *Die Gesetze der Angelsachsen*, *Ine's Gesetze*, p. 35, and *The Ancient Laws and Institutes of England*, printed by direction of the Commissioners on the Public Records, pp. 53 and 500.

nation; and this national characteristic is of no slight importance in an estimate of national temperament.

It is not a slow, heavy, phlegmatic people which rides 'across country'; the hunting-field gives a flat denial to that imputation which foreigners are apt to fling at us. The imputation results from a confusion between self-control and insensibility, between a virtue and a defect. It is not the man who is readiest with the knife, it is not the woman who is readiest with her tears, it is not the child who is readiest with its cries, that is most sensitive to insult or to pain. There is a disposition which is quick enough to perceive, and ready enough to resent an insult, but which is also quick to perceive the possibility of a mistake, and is unwilling to exhibit wrath without just cause. Such a disposition is by no means uncommon in England, and if by chance it displays itself in slowness of speech or of action, the cause lies frequently not in the deficiency but in the excess of sensitiveness. I do not intend, by these remarks, to suggest that the phlegmatic temperament does not exist in England. It exists, more or less, in all countries; and it exists to a considerable extent in England just as round heads exist in considerable numbers in England. But the national character, which foreigners attribute to us, has probably been in part imposed upon us, in consequence of our insular ideas of good breeding. Englishmen repress the feeling that Frenchmen especially delight to

display,* and affect a listlessness in society, which is atoned for by every gymnastic vagary that can be committed in any quarter of the globe—on either side of the equator.

Another cause which has certainly tended to give us a reputation for slowness, among foreigners, is our form of government, which renders it impossible for us to act, as a nation, with the rapidity which can be attained under a despotism. But, unless it can be shown that there is a necessary connexion between a phlegmatic national character and a form of government resembling ours, it is unfair to attribute to the English a phlegmatic disposition by reason of their dilatory action in foreign affairs. Such a connexion it will be found difficult to establish.

One of the best elements in the English character is its energy. It is that energy which is, above all other elements, the cause of the Englishman's various successes; it is that energy which gives his genius

* Or did formerly. An affectation of English tranquillity may now be commonly observed in French gentlemen. It is curious, too, to find a Dutchman of the sixteenth century attributing to the English traits of character which Englishmen of the nineteenth century have been in the habit of attributing to the French as distinguished from themselves. 'The English are zealous in attack, little fearing death; not revengeful, but fickle, presumptuous, rash, boastful, deceitful, very suspicious, especially of strangers, whom they despise. They are full of courteous and hypocritical gestures and words, which they consider to imply good manners, civility, and wisdom.'—Emanuel van Meteren, quoted in Motley's *History of the United Netherlands*, vol. i. p. 307.

its versatility—which forces into action the talents that in a phlegmatic people lie dormant. From that energy results the great variety of forms in which the Englishman's restless desire for athletic exercise displays itself. And from the same kind of energy resulted the similar diversity of forms in which the love of athletic exercise appeared among the ancient Greeks. Energy, restless insatiable energy, has been the leading characteristic of the two peoples; and it is a characteristic which we cannot find equally conspicuous among the Germans, the Dutch, or even the Danes. It is to the blood which we may probably possess in common with the ancient Greeks that we have reason to attribute this all-important element of our greatness.

It has been remarked* of the English that, 'when young, they cannot sit still an instant, so powerful is the desire for work, labour, excitement, muscular exertion.' It is instructive to compare this description, which will be recognised as true in the main, with the description given by M. Esquiros of the Dutch.† He tells us that the Dutch resemble no people in the world but the Dutch, that no stranger can fail to remark their essentially phlegmatic character, which is to be detected even in the inactivity of the children. This fact it will be very difficult to explain if it be admitted that the ancestors of the Dutch were in great part the ancestors of the English.

* By Dr. Knox, *The Races of Men*, p. 54.

† *La Néerlande et la Vie Hollandaise*, vol. i. p. 72, et seq.

And if the Saxons or Frisians were the ancestors of the English, we must have a common ancestry with the Dutch. Whence, then, comes the enormous difference of temperament? Not from the peoples speaking the High German dialects, for they resemble the Dutch. As Madame de Staël* has remarked, 'It is difficult to accustom oneself to the slowness and inactivity of the German people; they are never in a hurry; they find obstacles to everything; one hears the expression *it is impossible* a hundred times in Germany for once in France.' But, on the other hand, if the Dutch and Germans are proverbially phlegmatic, the Welsh, it will be objected, are proverbially fiery—proverbially, that is, in England. But I must here explain once more that I am not attempting to establish the resemblance of the English to the Welsh character, but rather to the character of that dolichocephalic people of which remains have been found in Britain and in the Cimbric Chersonese, and which is in all respects opposed to the true Teutonic type. I think it not impossible that some of our Anglo-Saxon and Scandinavian invaders, though speaking Teutonic dialects, were themselves almost as nearly akin to that old dolichocephalic people as to the brachycephalic Germans, from whom they are commonly supposed to be an offshoot. Of one of these alternatives, at least, I am tolerably certain; either that the Anglo-Saxons and Northmen were akin to that long-headed

* *De l'Allemagne*, p. 26.

race, or that they were not our ancestors. The probability seems to be that a series of dolichocephalic invaders, coming principally from the Cimbric Chersonese and its neighbourhood, peopled the southern part of this island; that they were driven hither partly by their own active disposition, partly by the pressure of the Germans on the east; and that the last comers had suffered so much from this pressure that they were a mixed people, speaking the language of the conquerors. It is probable that the present inhabitants of the old Anglo-Saxon home have far more German blood in their veins than the Anglo-Saxon colonists who made their language the language of South Britain.

The consideration of the more or less athletic characters of different nations led us naturally to the consideration of energy in general—of the evidences of strong will. It will perhaps be best to glance next at the emotional characteristics of different nations, before attempting to draw any conclusions from the complex phenomena of intellect.

It is difficult, as a rule, to pick out any particular emotion for the display of which any particular people is especially remarkable. There is much both in the emotions and in the intellect which is common to all human beings. But there is one emotion which is singularly characteristic of most nations classed under the name of Teutonic. That emotion is Wonder. So singularly developed is this

feeling among the Germans, so greatly do they love it, that a very large number of the adjectives in their language have formed permanent compounds with the word '*Wunder*' prefixed. They even have or once had an adverb '*wunders-halber*' —for the sake of exciting wonder. And this is no mere conventional way of speaking which has lost its meaning—no piece of slang used from the first without any definite meaning. When a German tells you that some, perhaps rather ordinary, object is '*wunderschön*,' he really means it, as you may see if you watch his features, and especially his eyes. His eyebrows are raised, his eyes protrude, and he is more excited than he ever appears to be under the influence of any emotion but wonder. The mention of a large sum of money especially excites this emotion in him; and it appears to give him immense delight to roll out the words *tausend* and *hundert*, and to repeat them again and again,—but always with the physical signs of wonder* fully displayed.

It is this remarkable fact which has caused many authors to speak enthusiastically of the *simple* character of the Germans; and it is, without doubt, a very pleasant thing to see wonder excited by an object which is wonderful only by reason of the effect it has produced. But it is hardly fair to attribute, for that reason, a childlike simplicity to the character of the Germans; their proneness to

* For the description of these signs, at length, *see* Bain, *The Emotions and the Will*, pp. 68–9.

wonder is a strong element in their character, but it represents neither the whole of their merits nor the whole of their demerits.

It must now be asked, is wonder also especially one of the emotional characteristics of the English? On the contrary, it requires a very powerful stimulus to excite the wonder of an Englishman; and when anything decidedly new is presented to him, he devotes little time to mere wonder, but ponders the question of utility. The Englishman can undoubtedly appreciate the wonders of the deep, but his energy prompts him to make experiments upon it, to utilise it. He can appreciate all the wonders of nature, but he has not enough respect for her to prevent him from asking questions of her, and from turning the answers to his own advantage. He is fully sensible of the wonders of his own intellect, but he does not evolve a system of philosophy out of his own self-consciousness when in a state of transcendental admiration. In short, one of the principal distinctions between the typical Englishman and the typical German is just the distinction between activity restrained by wonder, and activity urged on by energy and daring.

But is there any one emotion which is especially characteristic of the English? If there be such an emotion, it is the emotion of Shame which displays itself in the sense of decency possessed, more or less, by all classes of English. It is certainly true that

many individuals are wanting in that sense of decency; it is true that there are national customs in England which may perhaps exhibit less of that sense of decency than customs which exist in some Continental countries. But it will nevertheless be admitted by most English travellers that, when the Channel or the German Ocean is crossed, there is found a remarkable lack of what English people call modesty. German lovers, as some one not long ago remarked in the 'Saturday Review,' will sit, with hands clasped in hands, with eyes gazing into eyes, happily indifferent to an admiring crowd. In England men and women seem to be generally modest without making any violent effort to be so; on the Continent, men, women, and governments seem to make very praiseworthy efforts to be modest, without succeeding. There is, so far as England is concerned, a curious parallel to be found in ancient Greece, where there existed forms of worship which might be considered subversive of all modesty; and yet there existed, even in the time of Homer, a kind of modesty more like that which Englishmen possess than that which French and German governments enforce.*

I shall not imitate a recent writer on German manners, by giving the details of all the nastiness which an industrious man may discover in a remote German village. Such details, even when strictly accurate, can give but little evidence of national character, which is most fairly reflected in the works of

* *See* Homer, *Odyssey*, vi. 221.

great writers. And in Goethe's 'Wilhelm Meister' we may see how different are German ideas from English ideas of decency. Goethe's device for drawing his *sentimental* hero into closer communion with a mistress—the font at which he baptises his hero's young love—must be looked upon as one of the most remarkable creations in the whole range of literature.*

Had the story of 'Wilhelm Meister' less detail and more construction, it would remind us of Fielding's novels or of Smollett's. But neither Fielding nor Smollett, nor the most licentious of our dramatists, ever indulged in such nasty sentimentality as Goethe. Their sense of the ludicrous, if nothing else, would have prevented them. They, when they are nasty, are nasty for fun; he is nasty in sentimental earnest. They know they are sinning against decency, and enjoy the stolen fruit like boys robbing orchards; he is as innocent of shame as Eve before she plucked her first apple. He appears to be quite ignorant that he is transgressing. Nor, to all appearance, is he transgressing against German decency; for no one is more popular in Germany than Goethe, and

* I give, in self-defence, but with reluctance, the reference to this passage. It is in ch. xv. of the first book of *Wilhelm Meister's Lehrjahre*, and (in the edition published at Stuttgart and Tübingen in 1836), in vol. i. p. 78. I could refer to passages in other works, and by other German writers, which show a similar cast of mind; but I have no desire to imitate the editor who expunged the objectionable passages from the text of his author, and printed them all together in an appendix. The passages to which I have alluded are not only, perhaps not at all, licentious, but naïvely nasty.

nothing that he has written more popular than 'Wilhelm Meister.'

In France probably the passage to which I have referred would meet with no objection. It is of that kind which has, in England, been called French. But it is not more French than German; it is simply un-English. Nor do I wish by this or any other comparisons which I have made to disparage any nation. I wish only to sketch the English character, and to show that it differs widely from the German. We English have a right to our sentiments; and the Germans have without doubt also a right to theirs. This is not an essay on morals; it is not therefore necessary to argue that either nation is better or worse than the other; let it only be granted that they differ.

It has been said by Professor Bain* that there is such a thing as an emotional constitution, that an obese frame generally accompanies this constitution,† and that the Celtic 'races' are emotional as compared with the Teutonic 'races.' The ancient Greeks, he considers, resembled the modern Celts.‡

The discussion of all these propositions would involve us in a labyrinth from which it would be difficult to extricate ourselves. The generalisation which connects the emotional disposition with the obese frame seems hardly consistent with the wiry

* *On the Study of Character*, p. 204.
† *Ibid.* p. 217. ‡ *Ibid.* p. 218.

energetic constitution of the so-called Celts. But the identification of the Greek character with the Celtic character is a remarkable confirmation, from a wholly independent source, of the arguments already advanced in this essay to show the connexion between the ancient Britons and the ancient Greeks. And if modesty be essentially the emotional characteristic of the English people, it shows, perhaps, better than any other feeling could show, an exceedingly sensitive disposition in that people; it shows a very rapid appreciation of the opinion which will probably be entertained of any given action, a strong sense of self-respect, and a true consideration for the feelings of others.

With this modesty is closely connected the quality for which the Englishman is famous at home and abroad—the sense of independence—the sense of personal dignity apart from national dignity. The Englishman, like the Frenchman and the German, has the highest respect for his country, but he has a far greater respect for himself than has either the Frenchman or the German. He has a strong sense of personal, individual, responsibility, which often restrains both his tongue and his limbs. The Englishman loves his country, but believes that his country owes its existence in part to himself; the Frenchman loves his country, and the German loves his country, but each seems to consider that to his country he owes his existence. The Englishman looks on his country as his child; the German, like

the Frenchman, looks on his country as his parent. The Englishman takes pride in reflecting honour on his country; the German, like the Frenchman, sees honour reflected from his country on himself. The French and the German views of responsibility involve, in addition to the ordinary duties of self-preservation and the family cares, certain moral duties towards their respective countries; the English view of responsibility involves, still further, certain moral duties towards self. The Englishman cannot offend the susceptibilities of others without feeling that he has himself suffered. An Englishman wishes to satisfy himself, while Germans and Frenchmen are content to abide by the conventional rules of their own countries.

In any attempt to ascertain the intellectual characteristics of the ancient Britons, it is to the highest order among them, to the Druids, that our attention must be directed. The character of that order, their influence, their habits, and their attainments have been most carefully estimated by the author of the article 'Druids,' in the 'Encyclopædia Britannica;†

* The German calls it his *Vaterland*, the Frenchman *la patrie*, which also means the fatherland.

† The principal original authorities upon which that article is based are Diodorus Siculus, Strabo, Cæsar, Mela, Ammianus Marcellinus.

In confirmation it may be mentioned that there is among the Triads a triad of great astronomers—but, in the absence of dates, it is unsafe to assume that these three astronomers lived before the time of the Romans.

and as the authorities which he has consulted, and to which he has drawn attention, are all Greek or Latin writers, it is not probable that the portrait is too favourable.

The resemblance of the Druidic habits of mind to those of the ancient Greeks on the one hand, and to those of the modern English on the other, is most remarkable. The Druids had a system of philosophy which was so like the system of Pythagoras that it has frequently been supposed either that Pythagoras borrowed from them or that they borrowed from Pythagoras. Like many of the Greek philosophers, from Thales downwards, the Druids were fascinated by the great problems of the universe, and seem to have almost anticipated some of our modern theories. They held that the universe was never to be destroyed or annihilated, but was to undergo a succession of great changes or revolutions. Modern chemists hold that matter is indestructible; and the discovery that forces are interchangeable, is one which England may claim for herself.*

The spheroidal shape of the celestial bodies, and probably also of our own earth, seems to have been recognised by the Druids. This discovery and possibly too the belief in a circular or cycloidal motion of the planets seem to have influenced them in build-

* The merit of this great discovery lies between Mr. Grove and Mr. Joule. There is, I must admit, always a possibility that we may be merely reading our own thoughts into the writings of the ancients. But when all allowance is made for this source of error, there still remain very curious coincidences.

ing their temples—if indeed the remains found at Abury and elsewhere are of Druidic origin. The Druids certainly were well enough acquainted with the motions of the heavenly bodies to enable them to fix definite periods for their religious solemnities; but, as they reckoned by nights, and not by days, it is probable that they were best acquainted with the motions of the moon, and did not thoroughly comprehend the existence of a solar year.

The Druids were especially famed for their eloquence. The two nations who have also attained a high reputation for eloquence are the ancient Greeks and the modern English. No ancient nation has left such monuments of rhetorical power as the ancient Greeks; no modern nation possesses such monuments as are to be found in our 'Parliamentary Debates.'

But the great feature in the ancient British cast of mind seems to have been its constructive * power manifested in its poetry, and in its mechanical skill. The British bards have always been famous; and the halo of romance which has been thrown by them around the story of Arthur has given celebrity to his name in all European countries, so that even in France the name of Arthur is as well known as the name of Roland. The statement that the ancient Britons excelled in mechanics may seem perhaps to be no more than assumption. But it is certain either that the Britons possessed

* The term is here used in the sense in which it is used by Professor Bain, for which *see ante*, p. 182.

skill in mechanics or that they were endowed with some other unknown faculties which enabled them to produce such results as in our time can be produced only by mechanical skill. And, as it is never satisfactory to explain the *ignotum per ignotius*, it is only reasonable to assume that certain results were produced by such causes as we know to be capable of producing them. In that case, the stones found at Abury and Stonehenge, and in other parts of the island, show that the Britons used at least wedges and levers; they must have had also the means of transporting great weights to considerable distances; they were beyond all doubt acquainted with the use of wheels, because fighting from chariots was their favourite mode of warfare; and their basket-work was the admiration both of their Roman and of their Saxon conquerors.*

In like manner, constructive power was eminently characteristic of the ancient Greeks, and is eminently characteristic of the modern English. In the rude Cyclopean aggregations of stones, in the architectural adornments of the Acropolis at Athens, and in the final mechanical triumphs of Archimedes, the same love of invention may be detected; it may be detected in the ruins of Stonehenge,† in the wooden walls

* For further evidence of the general state of civilisation among the ancient Britons, *see ante*, p. 118.

† It is stated in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, art. 'Architecture,' p. 440, that 'it is the opinion of Mr. Higgins, supported, he contends, by the suffrages of Dodwell, Clarke, and others. . . that the doorway called the Gate of Lions, in the Acropolis of Mycenæ, is built exactly like the remains of Stonehenge.'

which England long ago made famous on the sea, and in the iron roads which she has but just given to the world.

Ancient Greece gave her mechanical inventions and her mechanical terms to Rome, and through Rome probably to a great portion of ancient Europe. Modern Britain has far surpassed the whole world, ancient or modern, in her constructive power. She has discovered how to use steam as a mechanical force; * she has applied steam to ships; † she has applied steam to locomotives on railways; ‡ she has discovered the art of photography; § she has invented calculating machines; || and her school of naval architecture is indisputably the first in the world. In addition to all this, Britain and her colonies have invented a number of minor machines, and improvements in machinery, which it would be tedious to name, but which stamp the British intellect with a mark that cannot be mistaken.

* By the Marquis of Worcester, Savery, and Watt. I am aware that there are many claims to this discovery, and that M. Arago has (in the *Annuaire du Bureau des Longitudes*, 1837) made the best of the case against the English. But even if we admit all the other claims—those of Hero of Alexandria, of Blasco de Garay, of Solomon de Caus, and of Dion Papin,—the claim of the English remains in all its integrity. Whether other people made the discovery or not, it is certain that the British made it for themselves, and rendered it practically and permanently available.

† By Miller and Taylor.

‡ By Trevithick and George Stephenson.

§ By Wedgewood and Sir Humphry Davy.

|| By Mr. Babbage.

The Germans may boast of Gutenberg as the inventor of printing, of König as an improver in the art, of Otto Guericke as the inventor of the air-pump; they may tell us that Winsor first lighted London with gas, and that Steinheil was the inventor of an electric telegraph. But it will be remarked that, with very few exceptions, there is an English claimant as well as a German claimant to the title of inventor, and that, even where the discovery is unquestionably made by the German alone, it comes to maturity in England. König's printing-press was set up first in England. There was an American and an English inventor of an electric telegraph contemporaneously with Steinheil; and Steinheil's was established in working order after Wheatstone's and Morse's. So, too, although Winsor hit upon a method of applying gas to street-lighting, he hit upon it in England, and after Murdoch had shown the achievement to be possible.*

It is no slight argument in favour of the mechanical genius possessed by the English that all the great inventions of modern times have first made their appearance in Britain; and it is perhaps not ungene-

* Mr. Lewes, who is certainly no enemy to the Germans, gives a curious instance of their carelessness about light: 'In the year 1685, the streets of London were first lighted with lamps; in 1775 Germany had not yet ventured on that experiment.'—*Life of Goethe*, p. 191. The Germans themselves admit our superior mechanical genius: 'In der Mechanik stehn wir, wie alle übrigen Völker, den Engländern nach.'—Menzel, *Die deutsche Literatur*, zweiter Theil, p. 33.

rous to assume that, when a foreigner living amongst us has succeeded in making some new discovery, he has owed a little to the general tendencies of the people among whom he has been living—to the state of science among his contemporaries. Be that, however, as it may, it does not appear that the Germans, even when all credit is allowed them for their inventions in this country, have approached us so nearly as the French. Some of our greatest mechanical successes are due to a French engineer, Brunel; and his block-machinery is in itself a great invention. Nicephore Niepce and Daguerre carried the art of photography to a perfection that Wedgewood and Davy failed to approach; and France possesses a number of engineers second only, if second, to those of England. There is a general argument, too, which may show that Germany stands lower than France in her reputation for mechanical skill: when foreign nations require skilful engineers, or well-made machinery, they commonly apply to England; but if not to England, to France.

In answer to this argument, it may perhaps be urged that the forms of government which exist in Germany are not so favourable to the development of mechanical genius as the form which exists in England. This is true; but, on the other hand, there must be an enormous psychical difference between the people which led the way in denying the right divine of kings, and the people which is

nearly the last of European nations to retain a belief in it.

Although, so far as I am aware, there is no Dutchman's name associated with any great invention, it would not be fair to say that the people of Holland have shown a deficiency of mechanical ability. There was a time, more than two hundred years ago, when Dutch engineers trained in the hard school of necessity were invited to assist us Englishmen. But the Dutch have never approached the successes of our modern English engineers.

Another form in which of late years English inventiveness has displayed itself is novel-writing. From mechanical skill to novel-writing may appear a very long jump. But novels and other works of art require the common element of constructive power, and differ from mechanical inventions in requiring the free play of the emotions and perhaps a different sensual organisation.* And it is in novel-writing that the female intellect of England seems to find the most appropriate outlet for its artistic emotion and its inventive power.

English novels travel over the whole civilised world; but they are especially popular in Germany, where the demand is so great that they are frequently translated into German, and still more

* I regret that I have no materials for a comparison of sensual excellencies or defects in different nations. They can only be inferred, if inferred at all, from the different forms in which intellectual energy displays itself.

frequently reprinted in the original. There is no corresponding importation of German * or Dutch novels into England, though there is some importation of French novels, which also find their way into Germany. It may be inferred, without rashness, from all these facts, that of the different nations under consideration the English are the most inventive, the Germans the least.

Nor will this conclusion be invalidated by a comparison of the dramatic power shown by the several peoples. England, it is true, though not inferior to Germany, is at present inferior to France in the production of dramas. But the drama in England has had a history which will bear comparison with the history of the drama in any other country. She has excelled equally in tragedy and in comedy; and in both she has had worthy rivals among the French. But it can hardly be said that Germany has had a drama of her own. It can hardly be said that she has produced playwrights who have earned fame by the skilful construction of plots, by the delineation of interesting characters consistent with the plots and with themselves, and above all by the

* Mr. Lewes confesses even of Goethe: 'Indeed, I must frankly say that, either from want of constructive instinct, or from an indolent and haughty indifference towards the public, his novels are quite unworthy of a great artist in point of *composition*.'—*Life of Goethe*, p. 509.

The deficiency of constructive power may be traced also in the style of most German works written in prose. There are, of course, some creditable exceptions; but, as a rule, the two characteristics of German prose are clumsiness and obscurity.

power of sustaining dramatic action. Germany once made a great effort in the persons of Lessing, Schiller, and Goethe, to establish a dramatic school of her own; and the effort produced some

* As Madame de Staël has remarked: 'la poésie, la philosophie, l'idéal enfin, ont souvent plus d'empire sur les Allemands que la nature et les passions mêmes.' And, 'les Allemands ont beaucoup d'audace dans les idées, dans le style, et peu d'invention dans le fond du sujet; leurs essais épiques se rapprochent presque toujours du genre lyrique; ceux des Français rentrent plutôt dans le genre dramatique.'—*De l'Allemagne*, pp. 218 and 159.

Goethe, according to English ideas at least, seems to have entirely misconceived the object of dramatic art. 'Such,' he says, 'are its beginnings; man in a rude state is content with action; when he attains some cultivation, he demands feeling; but reflection is welcome to him only when his cultivation is complete.'—*Wilhelm Meister's Lehrjahre*, p. 121.

Schlegel did not fail to perceive the object and essential character of the drama, but he was compelled to confess that the Germans have not displayed the dramatic faculty. 'A deeper examination,' he says, 'of æsthetic principles has led the Germans, a people naturally more speculative than practical, to elaborate their works of art, and especially their tragedies in accordance with more or less mistaken abstract theories. Their plays are not of a nature to produce any effect—nay, they are generally quite unfit for representation—on the stage, and are radically wanting in life.' And further, 'Men of distinguished ability have devoted themselves to the romantic drama, but they have taken a licence which is only allowable in the Romance itself, and have been careless about that coherence of parts which dramatic composition demands.'—*Schlegel, Dramatische Kunst*, zweiter Theil, p. 431.

As we are a hunting active people, I suspect that the emotion to which Professor Bain has given the name of *plot-interest* is more developed among us than among the Germans. If so, German dramatists are at a terrible disadvantage when compared with those of England.

very fine poetry, but served, at the same time, to show how deficient the German intellect is in the practical adaptation of means to ends. The plays are romantic, pathetic, excellent of their kind—but hardly fit for the stage; like all German plays, except perhaps those of Kotzebue, even when good poems, they are bad dramas.

In comedy Germany falls short even more than in tragedy; she is in fact almost destitute of comedy-writers. And this fact is an index to another broad distinction between the German intellect and the English intellect. Germans are heavier, slower, more given to admiration, than the English, and have, perhaps, as a necessary consequence, infinitely less wit and humour. It is probably, as before suggested, partly owing to our insular ideas of good breeding, that we have been called *tristes Anglais*. But the epithet is certainly unjust if meant as a description of our national character. England has produced a long line of comedy writers, wits, and humourists, which not even France or Ireland can surpass, and which leaves Germany far behind. And anyone who chooses to listen to the remarks made among our lower classes will discover an appreciation of wit and fun—coarse though it may be—which will convince him that we are not *tristes Anglais*, but inhabitants of 'Merrie England.'

And while no resemblance in this respect can be detected between England and either Germany or Holland, but, on the contrary, a very great dissimi-

larity, the resemblance between England and ancient Greece is complete. Both have produced great tragedy-writers, both have produced great comedy-writers, and the resemblance is none the less complete because English drama has not generally conformed to the Greek type; the divergence is only a proof of independent origin; and that independent origin is very strong evidence of similarity of intellect.

When we pass from the drama to other forms of art, the comparison becomes more difficult. The origin of what is called Gothic architecture, and especially of pointed Gothic,* is involved in such obscurity that it would be unsafe to attribute the discovery to any nation in particular. Once introduced, the style flourished in Germany, France, and England; but the English soon had a school of their own, which differed in important points from the German school. The Germans, true to their character, delighted in size and height, by which especially might be represented the wonderful, the mysterious. The English, true also to their character, aimed rather at internal decoration in which the taste for the beautiful might be gratified rather than the taste for the wonderful. The religious feeling of the English seems to have consisted principally of love, the religious feeling of the Germans to have consisted principally of awe.

And this taste for the wonderful, for the mysterious,

* *Ency. Brit.*, article 'Architecture,' pp. 446–7.

seems to betray itself, with other features of the German character, in the German school of music, in which alone the constructive power of the Germans is conspicuous.* Widely different from the passionate melodies of the Italians, from the more playful melodies of the French, German music suggests most frequently awe and admiration. Its harmonies, like the systems of German metaphysicians, though elaborated with the greatest care, delight in the undefined. They bewilder, and they are intended to bewilder.

Mr. Fergusson† denies that the Teutons possess artistic power of any kind, tells us that 'architecture, painting, and sculpture have been patronised, and have flourished in the exact ratio in which Celtic blood is found prevailing in any people in Europe, and have died out as Aryan influence prevails,' that the Teutons are wanting in creative and imaginative power, and that, where they appear, art flies before them.

Evidence has been adduced in this essay to show that the English are the most inventive of all the nations whose characteristics it is necessary for our present purpose to consider, and the Germans the least inventive; but it has not been suggested that the Germans are altogether devoid of inventive

* It must, however, be borne in mind that some of the most famous German composers have been of Jewish blood.

† *History of Architecture*, p. 517, seq. Where the word 'German' or 'Teuton' has been used in the text, Mr. Fergusson uses the word 'Aryan;' but according to his nomenclature 'Aryan' is synonymous with 'German' or 'Teutonic'—the Celtic nations being by him regarded as non-Aryan.

power; and still less will it be argued that they are altogether devoid of artistic power. Mr. Fergusson's verdict, literally interpreted, is hardly just if applied solely to the inhabitants of Germany; it is certainly unjust if intended to apply to the inhabitants of England. But if taken—as it was found necessary to take the statement of Tacitus, that the Germans had all light hair—as a general statement of a broad distinction, the verdict is probably true so far as it relates to the Germans proper. The verdict is only approximately true of the English so far as it relates to painting and sculpture. England has not certainly distinguished herself above other nations in those branches of art, but it has already been shown that her constructive power has been drawn off in other directions; and even in those two branches it is doubtful whether England has really been far inferior to any country except Italy.

The principles of art-criticism are so ill-defined, they are so different at different times, that the subject must necessarily be approached with fear and trembling, and in all humility. But the method of investigation which is pursued in this essay demands that some attempt shall be made to discover national characteristics in national art, and to compare them together when discovered. May future ethnologists make a more successful attempt than is made here! A man who has studied the different schools of painting for a lifetime, and who has also a taste for ethnology, would be best fitted for the task.

There are, unfortunately, but few who fulfil the first of these conditions; to them, however, we must apply for information.

Mr. Ruskin's opinion of German painting seems to be in accordance with what is said, in this chapter, of the mental characteristics of the Germans. He says:*

'The development of landscape north of the Alps presents us with the same general phases, under modifications dependent partly on less intensity of feeling, partly on diminished availableness of landscape material. That of the religious painters is treated with the same affectionate completion; but exuberance of fancy sometimes diminishes the influence of the imagination, and the absence of the Italian force of passion admits of *more patient and somewhat less intellectual elaboration.* A morbid habit of mind is evident in many, *seeming to lose sight of the balance and relations of things, so as to become intense in trifles, gloomily minute, as in Albert Dürer.* And this, mingled with a feverish operation of the fancy, which seems to result from certain habitual conditions of bodily health rather than of mental culture, and *of which the sickness without the power is eminently characteristic of the modern Germans*; but with all this there are virtues of the very highest order in those schools, and I regret that my knowledge is insufficient to admit of my giving any detailed account of them.'

This description seems to indicate a desire to

* *Modern Painters*, vol. i. pp. 88, 89. The Italics are mine.

excite wonder, no matter how; to impress spectators with a vague sense of the mysterious. And this desire is coupled with another peculiarity which, as will subsequently be seen, is also characteristic of German science—an extraordinary love for the accumulation of minute details,* but, as a rule, without any corresponding development of constructive power.

And this same love of detail appears also in the Dutch school of painting. To quote again from Mr. Ruskin:†

'Among the professed landscapists of the Dutch school we find much dexterous imitation of certain kinds of nature, remarkable usually for its persevering rejection of whatever is great, valuable, or affecting in the object studied.' . . . 'The object of the great body of them is merely to display manual dexterities of one kind or another.'

And again:‡

'But, whatever patient merit or commercial value

* This is found even in Goethe, the least German of all the Germans. In criticising *Die Wahlverwandtschaften*, Mr. Lewes has remarked: 'If English and French readers sometimes feel a little wearied by the many small details which encumber the march of the story, and irritate the curiosity, which is impatient for the *dénouement*, no such weariness is felt by German readers, who enjoy the details, and the purpose which they are supposed to serve.' Mr. Lewes confesses that the stress laid on these details 'is out of all proportion and somewhat tedious.'—*Life of Goethe*, p. 509.

† *Modern Painters*, vol. i. p. 90.

‡ *Ibid.* vol. v. p. 281.

may be in Dutch labour, this at least is clear, that it is wholly insensitive.

'The very mastery these men have of their business proceeds from their never really seeing the whole of anything, but only that part of it which they know how to do.' And more to the same effect.

Mr. Wornum's account of the Dutch school is not, in the main, at variance with that of Mr. Ruskin:

'The works of their Dutch contemporaries, on the other hand, were remarkable for scrupulous fidelity of imitation, and the closest familiarity of subject. The characteristic Dutch school dates its origin from this period (the seventeenth century); and it may, perhaps, not unjustly be termed the illusive or the microscopic school, minute exactness of imitation being its principal element. Every branch of art—history, *genre*, landscape, portrait, all are alike conspicuous for the most scrupulous imitation, even to the utmost elaboration of the textures of substances. Viewing, therefore, this school æsthetically, illusion may be said to be its characteristic element; though, of course, practically such an end could be only occasionally attained, and that chiefly in minute or inanimate objects, which the human eye, in its daily experience, from their familiarity, looks at but superficially.'*

But it must not be forgotten that the Dutch produced Rembrandt, and that Rubens, though a native of Cologne, was of the Dutch school.

* Wornum's *Epochs of Painting*, p. 433.

'At the same time, and in the same place also, arose another school different in its nature from these two, which are founded on general principles; one characterised by and depending upon the elaboration of only a single element in art, that of light and shade.* The founder of this subjective school was Rembrandt van Rhyn, the most attractive and original of painters.'*

Rembrandt seems to have excelled all the Dutch school in constructive power; he soared above simple imitation, and attained originality. Rubens, too, possessed great constructive power, even though the composition of his 'Descent from the Cross' may have been borrowed from an Italian print.†

But the national characteristics appear not so much in the exceptions as in the general body of artists. There are exceptional individuals in all nations, and there can be no greater error in ethnology than to suppose that, because a nation has a particular type, either corporeal or mental, all the individuals of the nation must conform to that type. Germany produced Rubens, and Holland produced Rembrandt, but those painters cannot be accepted as the types of their respective nations, because there is evidence to prove that the types of those nations are extremely different.

When we pass over to England, we find it more difficult to assign any distinctive peculiarity to her

* Wornum's *Epochs of Painting*, p. 433.

† Sir Joshua Reynolds, ap. Wornum, p. 427.

painters. It has already been remarked that the constructive power of the English has been diverted into other channels; it is, therefore, probable that the great and characteristic school of English painting has yet to arise. But if English painters have a characteristic, it is probably that constructive power of which so much has already been said.

Of one of Gainsborough's pictures, Mr. Ruskin has remarked,* 'nothing can be more bold or *inventive*.' Mr. Ruskin also speaks of the faculty of imaginative association, which seems to be nearly identical with the constructive association of Professor Bain. This faculty, he considers, was possessed in the highest degree by Turner; and of Turner's 'Slave-ship' he says:† '*its daring conception*, ideal in the highest sense of the word, is based on the purest truth, and wrought out with the concentrated knowledge of a life.'

But it is not safe to generalise from one or two instances; it is not safe to assert more of the English school of painting than that its constructive power is at least as well marked as any other characteristic. If this be admitted, the art-characteristics of the different nations which have been compared, though they will have added but little to confirm our previous conclusions, will certainly not be found to throw any doubt upon them.

And before dismissing this part of the subject, it

* *Modern Painters*, vol. i. p. 9.
† *Ibid.* vol. i. p. 377.

may be worth while to draw attention to the fact that, whatever their artistic skill may be, the English are certainly great lovers of beauty. This is manifest from the beauty of the people, and especially of the women. It is a well-ascertained fact that personal peculiarities are hereditary; and if the English were in the habit of selecting ill-favoured wives and husbands, it is impossible that they could be generally well-favoured. That they are so is generally admitted even by foreigners; and it is irrational to attribute the fact to mere chance when the principle of 'conjugal selection' * thoroughly explains it.

The beauty of the ancient Greek features and form are also proverbial.

Among modern European nations there are probably none who have excelled the English in poetry; perhaps none but the Italians, who have approached them. From Chaucer, through Shakspeare, Spenser, Milton, Pope, Shelley, Byron, and a host of others, even to the present day, there has been a succession of poets, of which any nation may reasonably be proud. There is perhaps no kind of poetry of which the English have not produced good specimens; and there is hardly any branch of the art in which they have not displayed originality. Here the resemblance is well-marked between the English, the ancient Britons, and the ancient Greeks; and hardly less well-marked is the contrast between the English and

* This is fully explained by Mr. Darwin in his work on *The Origin of Species*.

the Germans. The German poets, though numerous, resemble one another in their almost universal love of the wonderful, the mystic, the supernatural.* It is through wonder that the Germans are most readily moved, while other European nations have wider emotional sympathies. Thus it happens that, with the exception of Goethe and Schiller, Germany has produced scarcely a poet of European reputation; and even Goethe and Schiller, great as they certainly were, owed not a little to their study of Shakspeare. And it may be remarked that, while the Germans, always enamoured of the wonderful, always anxious to elaborate, are frequently turgid and obscure, and

* Madame de Staël was struck by this national characteristic and by the contrast which the English present: 'Le principe de la terreur, qui est un des grands moyens de la poésie allemande, a moins d'ascendant sur l'imagination des Anglais de nos jours.' (*De l'Allemagne*, p. 125.) And the Germans themselves take pleasure in calling attention to the same fact. Menzel declares that the German character may be considered eminently poetical because it is 'so schwärmerisch, gutmüthig, phantastisch, abergläubisch, warm und gewitterhaft,' and because it has so great an 'Illusion für das Fremde und Wunderbare.' The German poets are generally romantic, and the Romantic is always characterised by 'etwas Wunderbarem und Geheimniszvollem.' (*Die deutsche Literatur*, zweiter Theil, pp. 45, 55, 94.)

It is clear that, if the German character is poetical, and if the chief thing needful to that character is the love of the wonderful, this love of the wonderful must be the principal feature in the German disposition. Menzel, whose style contrasts most favourably with that of most German prose writers, draws this happy distinction: 'Die antike Poesie zog selbst das Wunderbare der Religion in den Kreis des Natürlichen, die romantische machte selbst aus dem Natürlichen etwas Wunderbares und Religiöses.' (p. 94.) *See* also note p. 228 of this essay.

have displayed but little variety in their compositions, the English may set up Shakspeare as a model for versatility, Pope as a model for clearness and rhythm, and Byron as a model for descriptive power and beauty of simile.

As in dramatic poetry, so in all other kinds of poetry, constructive power is a necessary element, but most of all in dramatic poetry. But one of the most essential qualities for composing all kinds of poetry is the faculty of perceiving resemblances. That faculty is equally necessary in the experimental sciences, in the arts—wherever genius can show itself. It has not been considered in the comparisons already drawn, because it was thought that the consideration of one element at a time would have the effect of making the subject clearer, and because, in those intellectual phenomena, which have hitherto been discussed, constructive power was thought to be the distinctive element. But in all kinds of poetry, except the dramatic, the faculty of perceiving resemblances may perhaps be considered of no less importance than even constructive power.

The comparison drawn between the poetry of Germany and of England seems to leave the balance of 'similarity,'* no less than of constructive power, in favour of England, while, on the other hand, the great elaboration which characterises almost all

* The word is used here in the sense in which Professor Bain has used it—for the faculty of perceiving resemblances.

forms of German art seems to incline the balance, so far as contiguity * or retentiveness is concerned, in favour of Germany. And a comparison of German philosophy and science with the philosophy and science of England will lead to a similar conclusion.

It has been said by Mr. Fergusson † that to the Aryans (by which term he designates the Germans, as opposed to the Celts) 'induction owes its birth.' Induction, in a sense, owes its birth to the English, but it seems, even when born, to be absolutely repugnant to the German mind. German intellect displays itself in two forms: sometimes it assumes certain premises, and reasons out from them a system of philosophy which is complete in every detail; sometimes it collects an immense mass of facts, some important, some unimportant, which are either not reasoned upon at all or are reasoned upon without having previously been digested. In the former case endless systems of metaphysics come forth, each at variance with its predecessor; in the latter case appear lexicons, grammars, editions of the classics, monographs upon various subjects. In the former case the details of all those questions which the system is to explain seem to be carefully impressed upon the mind before the premises are assumed; in the latter case fact after fact is heaped up with a perseverance which would be painful to any human being not gifted with extraordinary powers of retention,

* Which embraces observation and memory.

† *History of Architecture*, p. 523.

which would be considered labour lost by anyone possessed of strong 'similarity,' of good powers of classification. But in both cases the love of the wonderful, of the mystic, is strongly marked.* In the one case it is gratified by reasoning from the unknown to the unknown; in the other case it is gratified by mere mass or quantity, by the '*wunder-grosz.*'

But both the emotion of wonder and the love of detail for itself are antagonistic to the spirit of induction—a spirit which has been characteristic of English genius even when it has been tempted into the quicksands of philosophy. Through that spirit Hobbes was led to the psychological discovery of the laws of association. Through that spirit Hartley trod in the same path, and was led to similar conclusions. Through that spirit the investigations of Locke and Berkeley have suggested to later thinkers that the study of metaphysics—though not necessarily of psychology—must always be futile. In all these cases the result has been arrived at by *reasoning on experience.*

Far different has been the progress of German speculation. Always subjective, and therefore always

* I quote here the opinion of Mr. Taylor, a most enthusiastic admirer of the Germans: 'Oftener exuberant than condensed, they linger too long over their topics; and at times degenerate into mysticism and vague sensitivity. . . Their dramas are overloaded with description. . . They delight especially in a marvellous and almost grotesque terrorism of fable.'—*Historic Survey of German Poetry*, vol. iii. p. 453.

dogmatic, the school of German metaphysics has, since the time of Kant, passed through a period of dogmatic pantheism, and has at last culminated in equally dogmatic atheism.* This fact is a curious refutation of the assertion made by Mr. Fergusson, that it is especially the German who recognises one God, and especially the Celt who recognises many.

But as all the reasoning processes have been referred to the 'law of similarity,' it may fairly be suggested that the Germans, having shown a great love of abstract speculation, must necessarily possess great powers of perceiving resemblances—that they must be strong in the faculty of 'similarity.' To adopt the language of Mr. Mill†—whose theory of the reasoning processes will be found to be in accordance with that of Professor Bain—deductive reasoning depends upon the discovery of '*marks*' of certain qualities, or of '*marks of those marks*;' and for the discovery of such marks there is undoubtedly required a strong faculty of 'similarity.' But in order to make sure of what is commonly called the universal proposition before drawing deductions from it, a far stronger faculty of 'similarity' is necessary. It is the general law which is the true foundation of all sound deductive reasoning; and it is the discovery of the general law which, above all things, requires an intellect powerful in perceiving resemblances in the midst of differences. A certain power of deducing

* For this *see* the work of Dr. Büchner, *Kraft und Stoff.*

† *System of Logic, Of the Functions of the Syllogism.*

results from a general law may be acquired; for the discovery of the law itself nothing will suffice but a great natural endowment.

Nor can this fact be disproved by the equally certain fact that all sound reasoning is from particulars to particulars, that the universal proposition is but a convenient registration of observed phenomena.* By the careful application of certain rules any moderately gifted man having a love of detail may reason correctly from certain data, and his conclusion will be as correct as the data themselves; but it is only the man with a genius for perceiving resemblances who can establish those data on a scientific footing. The true man of science—the man who reasons from observed facts—discovers that a certain phenomenon has, in a great number of instances, accompanied or followed a certain other phenomenon or certain other phenomena; he probably makes certain experiments, or certain new observations, with a view of eliminating all possible conditions but those which he supposes to be invariably accompanied or followed by the phenomenon in question; he then pronounces that, wherever certain phenomena are found, a certain other phenomenon will be found also; and from that discovery further useful results may be deduced according to fixed rules. But although a certain amount of ingenuity is, without doubt, necessary for the discovery of such new results, there is an enormous difference between the

* Mill, *System of Logic, Of the Functions of the Syllogism.*

discovery of those new results and the first discovery of the law; and that difference is just the difference between scientific reasoning and mere subjective reasoning; perhaps it is not too much to say between the typical English intellect and the typical German intellect.

Germany has, without doubt, produced great discoverers—great generalisers from experience. Such men were Copernicus,* Kepler, Leibnitz, Goethe, and Oken. There is perhaps no European nation which has not produced great discoverers. Italy has produced, among others, Ubaldi, Galileo, Torricelli, the Bernouillis, Galvani; France has produced Descartes, La Grange, La Place; England has produced Newton, Halley, and other great astronomers, in addition to all those great inventors who have already been mentioned. She has produced Harvey and Jenner, of whom the former may be called the father of physiology; the latter is the discoverer of the only valuable prophylactic. The steady scientific method of the English is characteristic of the people, and is essentially opposed to the method usually adopted by the Germans. The English, *par excellence*, the

'Audax Iapeti genus,'

have divested themselves of that greatest of impediments, wonder. As Professor Bain has remarked,† 'in matters of truth and falsehood, wonder is one of

* Whose ancestry, however, may possibly have been Polish.

† *The Emotions and the Will*, pp. 69–70.

the corrupting emotions. The narrations of matter of fact are constantly perverted by it; while in science Bacon might have enrolled it among his "idola."

The English know the true value of facts; they know how to arrange them, to classify them, to utilise them. They know also the true value of theories; they know how to verify them, to apply them, to utilise them. The Germans, on the other hand, seem to value facts for their quantity rather than for their quality; to value theories for their mysticism, for the satisfaction they afford to the theoriser, rather than for their agreement with established facts. And hence even Oken—perhaps the most extraordinary discoverer of resemblances that any country has produced—was so little careful to make sure of his facts that he is famous only because he claimed, as Goethe claimed, to have discovered the homologies of the skeleton.* His power of similarity was enormous, but he lacked that constructive power which is necessary for verification.

When, therefore, it is remembered that both constructive power and power of perceiving resemblances are necessary for all great discoveries, for all great inventions, for all great poems, it will be seen that in those two regions of the human mind the Germans are somewhat circumscribed as compared with the English. It appears that, where an individual among them has one of those faculties highly developed,

* *See* Bain, *The Senses and the Intellect*, p. 511.

he is deficient in the other; Germany can produce an Oken strong in 'similarity,' or a Handel strong in constructive power, but not a Newton or a Shakspeare equally strong in both. When, on the other hand, it is remembered that strong retentiveness is required for compilations of all kinds, in which the Germans especially excel, it will be seen that in that region of the mind the Germans are apparently superior to the English. And from these two considerations it will be seen that there is a twofold distinction between the intellect of the Germans and the intellect of the English *—a distinction such as might be expected when the different types of skulls prevailing among the two nations are borne in mind.

And there exists between the Teutonic nations and the English a moral difference, precisely analogous to these intellectual distinctions. The people of all European nations are fond of amassing money

* I think I cannot do better than quote in this place a passage from a German writer who arrived at a similar conclusion by a very different process. 'Let us,' says Haym, 'compare the scientific works of the English with those of the Germans, and we shall soon enough perceive that the type of English thought is essentially different from our own; that the scientific tendencies of the countrymen of Bacon and Locke take a totally different direction, and proceed by totally different stages, from those of the countrymen of Hegel and Kant; that their combinations differ fundamentally, and differ in the minor details.'—*Hegel und seine Zeit*, p. 309. I am indebted to Mr. Stirling's *Secret of Hegel* for the knowledge that a German has expressed so very strong an opinion; but I have myself verified the reference, and re-translated the passage.

—the Germans perhaps not less than the English. But the Teutonic nations seem to have a greater love of money for its own sake than the English. Precisely as the Germans amass facts without caring for the results which may follow, they amass money without any corresponding desire to spend it. The great German merchant is a merchant; the great English merchant is a merchant-prince. The remark which M. Esquiros * has acutely made respecting the Dutch is no less true of the Germans: 'le propre du caractère hollandais, même quand il s'élève vers la grandeur, est de rester simple.' The *simplicity* of the German character is proverbial.

It has been said,† too, that the Germans resemble the ancient Greeks in sending forth numerous colonies. No statement can be farther from the truth. The Germans *emigrate*, but do not *colonise*; precisely as they carry a new discovery to farther results more frequently than they make the discovery itself. England is the great coloniser, just as in former times Greece was the great coloniser; but wherever England sends colonists, Germany *afterwards* sends emigrants. There is an immense difference between these two things; a difference as great as that between wonder and daring.

An attempt has been made in the foregoing sketches

* *La Néerlande et la Vie Hollandaise*, vol. i. p. 83.

† Donaldson, *New Cratylus*, p. 132.

—and they cannot pretend to be anything more—to show that there is a well-marked distinction between the psychical characteristics of the Teutonic peoples and those of the English, just as there is a well-marked distinction between their respective physical characteristics. And at the same time an attempt has been made to show that, where the English differ from the Germans, they agree with the ancient Greeks, while the Greeks form, as it were, the connecting link between the ancient Britons and the modern English. No small portion of this essay has been devoted to the investigation of the evidence for that link; but there is yet a little more evidence which it is more convenient to introduce here than elsewhere.

Every Greek scholar knows better than he can express the meaning of the Greek τὸ καλόν; and yet there is a very near approach to that meaning in a Welsh Triad, which may possibly be of remote origin: 'the three ultimate intentions of bardism; to reform the morals and customs; to secure peace; to celebrate (or encourage) all that is good, and excellent.'* And on the other hand the institutions and the character on which the Englishman prides himself show the existence of a very similar spirit. English courts of justice are acknowledged to be the fairest and most merciful in the world; the English love of 'fair play' is hardly ever out of an Englishman's mouth; and

* The translation of Davies (*Celtic Researches*) is here adopted.

an Englishman's sense of honour is the necessary counterpart of his 'pluck.'

It is difficult to compare the scientific methods of any ancient nation, or the results attained by them with those of any modern nation. As Mr. G. H. Lewes has happily remarked:* 'Science is a growth. The future must issue from seeds sown in the past. The bare and herbless granite must first be covered with mosses and lichens, and from their decay is to be formed the nidus of a higher life.'

But Aristotle is more nearly resembled by Bacon or by Hobbes than by any thinkers of other countries. Aristotle saw dimly, as Bacon saw clearly, that theories must be worthless unless based on facts; he discovered, from the *facts* of his own consciousness, what Hobbes—more definitely perhaps—discovered again, that there existed some sort of order even in the caprices of memory or fancy.

Statesmen both in England and in ancient Greece have generally conformed to a common type. They have won the confidence and the love of their countrymen not less by their moral character than by their intellectual attainments. Not separated by an impassable gulf from the great body of those who have trusted them with power, they have been the representatives of their country—not an independent class existing apart. In their greatest statesmen the modern Englishman and the ancient Greek of average disposition and attainments have been able to recog-

* *Aristotle*, p. 47.

nise themselves as in flattering portraits. In those statesmen the great characteristics of Greeks and Englishmen have been most conspicuous because most magnified. Such statesmen—and a number might be cited from the annals of either country—have been energetic, generous, honourable, hospitable, full of all human sympathies; they have not sacrificed the man to the politician. With life and vigour to spare, after giving the cares of state their due, they have excelled in the literature, the art, and even the science of their day. They have learned to shine in the *salon* no less than in the national assembly. But, above all, they have fostered, and even taken part in all the pastimes and athletic sports of their country: and where such pursuits have led them into reckless extravagancies, their vagaries have been readily forgiven as mere exaggerations of national good qualities.

Northern Germany has not produced such statesmen in great numbers.

CHAPTER V.

RESULTS OF THE ENQUIRY.

It now remains only to draw together the scattered threads of the argument, to show, if possible, that they may be woven into a rope which no ordinary strain can tear asunder. The first part of the essay is destructive no less than constructive. The last part is principally constructive. In the chapters on the historical and philological evidence an attempt was made not so much to arrive at any definite conclusion as to show that those two branches of enquiry did not suggest any conclusion opposed to the evidence which was to follow, but pointed rather in the same direction. It was necessary to clear away a great mass of prejudice; evidence often supposed to be historical was shown to be utterly worthless; and the philological evidence was shown to be of value only when supported by other independent evidence. When the testimony of Gildas was rejected, when the Triads were regarded not as history but as tradition, it became necessary to estimate the probabilities furnished by the history of other countries, and by the geographical position and extent of various districts.

Such considerations suggested a probability that pre-Roman Britain was almost exclusively non-Teutonic; that the Roman occupation could have had but little effect upon a population so numerous as that of ancient Britain; that the number of Saxon invaders must have been small when compared with that of the Britons; that the Saxon element must have suffered more than the British element from the Danes; that the Norman conquest could not have effected any great change in the character of the population; and finally that, even after the whole series of invasions and conquests, it was not improbable that the British element, such as it was before the Roman occupation, might still have preponderated even in the eastern portion of the island. But all these probabilities were regarded as mere probabilities suggested by general considerations rather than by specific evidence.

The investigation of the philological evidence also threw but little light directly on the subject. Numerous instances were brought forward to show that the same language may be spoken by nations of different blood; that a change of language in any country by no means implies a total change of people, and that therefore the partly Anglo-Saxon origin of the English language does not necessarily imply the Anglo-Saxon origin of the English people. It was remarked also that not only is there a small Cymric element in the English vocabulary, but that the Cymric pronunciation has produced a well-

marked distinction between English and other languages of Teutonic origin. But still no definite conclusion could be arrived at; it was probable that there were two or more different elements in the population, but there was no evidence to establish the proportions of those elements.

But the examination of physical characteristics led us to more satisfactory results. It was ascertained that dark hair is more prevalent in England than in the Teutonic countries, and that it was more prevalent in ancient Britain than in ancient Germany; that the typical English skull is of a very long oval form, while the typical German skull is of a very short oval form; that all the evidence which has been collected shows the Cymric* skull to be of the long oval form, but slightly longer in proportion to its breadth than the typical English skull; that the ancient Britons were remarkable for their lofty stature no less than the modern English; and that this lofty stature is especially found among the most Celtic population of the west.

And the examination of psychical characteristics led to results hardly less conclusive than the examination of physical characteristics. But the meagre-

* The word 'Cymric,' it is perhaps unnecessary again to point out, is not used as a synonyme for Welsh. But it can never be too often repeated that the people possessing any ethnic name are not necessarily the best representatives of its original possessors. The Hellenes, for instance, were less truly Hellenes after their conquest of Greece than before; and for that reason, when I have found it necessary to mention the inhabitants of 'Hellas,' I have called them by the general name of 'Greeks.'

ness of the knowledge which we possess of ancient British manners, customs, and capabilities, rendered it necessary to seek elsewhere for some other branch of the same Cymric stock as a standard of comparison. In this search philology pointed out the way, and for once apparently pointed in the right direction; she was trusted provisionally because she told not only of resemblances in words but of resemblances in the forms which those words took, and, above all, of characteristic resemblances in pronunciation.

Further enquiry brought to light some traditional, if not historical, evidence of a connexion between the ancient Greeks and the ancient Britons; and the most conclusive testimony of all was found to be the existence of the long-oval Cymric head, not only in Athenian graves, but on the shoulders of the Apollo, the Greek ideal of beauty. And moreover, just as a shorter non-Cymric head existed among the ancient Britons so a shorter non-Cymric head existed among the ancient Greeks, and exists among the modern English. It is to be found on the shoulders of the Heracles, and on the shoulders of many an English prize-fighter.

And, lastly, evidence was discovered that the ancient British mind had all the elements of the Greek mind; had the element of constructive power, which appears in the stones of Abury, the Cyclopean structures or the more perfect architecture of Greece; had those elements of intellectual greatness which make bards and poets of all kinds,

and which have produced in the philosophy of the Druids at least an apparent resemblance to some forms of philosophy in Greece.

This combination of resemblances, philological, physical, and mental, has suggested the comparison of the English mind with the Greek mind where a direct comparison with the ancient British mind was impossible.

And it has been found that the characteristics of the English generally agree with those of the Greeks, while they differ *toto cœlo* from those of the Germans. These resemblances and differences have been traced in the various psychical manifestations—in the energy, the will, and the muscular activity, in the characteristic emotions, in the constructive power, in the power of detecting resemblances, and in the power of retaining and recalling past impressions; they have been traced in all the principal branches of art and science; and the result obtained runs exactly parallel to the result obtained from the investigation of physical characteristics.

The English type agrees in the main, though showing some minor variations, with the Cymric type of head, of feature, of frame, and of mind; and that type not only differs from the Teutonic type but stands at the opposite end of the scale. It is impossible to identify the Englishman, who is long-skulled, generally dark-haired, athletic, energetic, enterprising, daring, practical, magnificent, with the Northern German, who is short-skulled, less frequently dark-

haired, wondering, placid, unpractical, simple in his habits, even when rich. The Germans have their merits and their faults, as the English have their merits and their faults; but the merits of the Germans are not the merits of the English, and the faults of the Germans are not the faults of the English.

But let us not too hastily rush to a conclusion. Let us consider all possible hypotheses which may account for the phenomena. Of such hypotheses three suggest themselves: the first is that the medium (i.e. the climate, food, aspects of nature, &c.) may so modify physical and psychical characteristics that in the same place they will always conform to the same type, and that therefore the English type resembles the Cymric type; the second hypothesis is that a preponderance of Cymric blood in the invaders who came from the Cimbric Chersonese and its neighbourhood may have caused, wholly or in part, that resemblance which is to be traced between the ancient Britons and the modern English; the third hypothesis is that the ancient pre-Roman inhabitants greatly outnumbered the invaders of different blood who at different periods obtained a footing in the island.

The first hypothesis has no evidence to support it, but, on the contrary, is contradicted by all the known facts which bear upon the question. Negroes, when transported to another hemisphere, do not, in several generations, show such signs of variation as to render it probable that the Teutonic type of head and

character could have been transformed into the Cymric type in fourteen hundred years;* and even if such a transformation were considered possible, the existence of the Cymric type in ancient Greece, in a totally different medium, would have to be explained. And, last of all, the co-existence of two quite opposite types both in England and in ancient Greece proves that there is nothing in the medium of either country to prevent the existence of either type, and that we must seek elsewhere for the reasons why one type is greatly outnumbered by the other. The first hypothesis may therefore be dismissed as untenable.†

The second hypothesis, the hypothesis that the Anglo-Saxons approached the Cymric type, and were in part of Cymric blood, cannot be so easily dismissed,

* Professor Wilson, of Toronto, has shown in a paper published in the *Anthropological Review* (vol. iii. p. 73, et seq.), that the English and French Canadians have both preserved their respective national characteristics.

† The above remarks apply chiefly to the theory that the physical characteristics are directly changed by the external conditions. It would be impossible to show that the Darwinian process of natural selection has not to some extent operated in eliminating the German type. But if so, the variation from the short-headed, fair-haired type, whose intellect is characterised by a desire to collect rather than to classify, can, unlike the ordinary Darwinian variation, be traced to a definite cause—to atavism. We cannot tell why a domesticated animal produces offspring slightly varying from the general type of its species; but we can tell, with tolerable certainty, why an Englishman whose remote ancestor was a negro presents some features of resemblance to the negro type. So also we have good reason to trace the English features to the ancient type which they resemble.

but is, on the other hand, of less importance in the enquiry. The skulls which have been found in the Anglo-Saxon graves may have been those of pure Anglo-Saxons, or those of pure Britons, or those of cross-breeds with a preponderance of either Anglo-Saxon or British blood. And it matters but little whether an individual sprung from any given stock, and possessing the characteristics of that stock, be born in Jutland, Holland, or Britain. An English child is still an English child if born in Canada. If the Cape of Good Hope were peopled partly by English from Canada, partly by English from Britain, it would be impossible to determine from their characteristics the birth-places of the settlers, and it would be folly to make the attempt. In like manner, it is useless to attempt to determine how far, if at all, our Cymric characteristics are traceable to the Cymry of Britain, how far to the Cymry of the Chersonese.

Let it content us to know that our characteristics are, in the main, decidedly Cymric; that in spite of the Romans and their legions, in spite of the Angles, the Saxons, the Frisians, the Jutes, the Danes, and the Normans, the people of Britain have developed into very nearly that kind of maturity which might have been expected from her pre-Roman inhabitants.

But let it nevertheless not be forgotten that there are certain minor points of difference between the characteristics of the Cymry, so far as we have been able to ascertain them, and the characteristics of the English. Such a result would, if we allow the possi-

bility of a mixed race, follow naturally upon an intermixture of a small proportion of Teutonic blood with a very large proportion of Cymric blood. That such an intermixture has taken place, and that the English nation has been formed in consequence of that intermixture, there seems no reason to doubt. There is a mass of independent evidence, collected from different quarters, all pointing in that direction; there is no evidence which, when carefully examined, points in a contrary direction. Until, therefore, some fresh and altogether unlooked-for evidence can be produced, it must be pronounced that the English nation is most certainly not a Teutonic nation. All the principal characteristics of the English can be traced to a non-Teutonic, to a Cymric, source; and although there are slight modifications which are probably owing in part at least to Teutonic blood, those modifications are not of sufficient importance to produce even a distant approach to the Teutonic type.

'Reason the card, but passion is the gale,' says Pope; and the Englishman owes his passions and his reasoning powers to the Cymry; but when the Saxons came, Britain supplied herself with a certain portion of a ship's equipment which is not without its value in a storm; she took in ballast. Since that time her navigation has been most successful; but it would be as absurd to attribute the good sailing-qualities of a ship to the ballast which she might happen to carry as to attribute English energy and

genius to a few drops of Teutonic blood. Nitrogen, mixed with oxygen in the air, like ballast in a ship, is useful; it serves to prevent too rapid combustion, too rapid waste of tissue; but its use is merely subsidiary. In the same way the slight infusion of Teutonic blood into Cymric veins may serve to keep us steady, but it can no more make Englishmen—Britons—of us than nitrogen can support life.

There is still among us that life and vigour which the Britons possessed in the time of Tacitus; we still boast in our national songs that we are Britons, that we can be good subjects, but know not how to be slaves. Few of us, perhaps, when joining in those songs, pause to reflect that we are saying of ourselves just what Tacitus said of the Britons of old: 'Jam domiti ut pareant, nondum ut serviant.'

It is now nearly 2,000 years since Britain and the Druids became known to the Romans, and still the cartloads of mistletoe which are brought to London every Christmas tell, year after year, that the Druidic worship yet lingers among us in one at least of its forms; that it has carried its chief emblem unharmed in the face of four distinct invading peoples; that it has in that emblem survived the Roman edict for its suppression, the introduction of Christianity, the Reformation, and all the disputes which have divided English Christians among themselves.

It seems that in his greatest misfortunes the Briton has always been as he was in the time of Horace—unbroken, unconquered by adversity, fearless even

when a captive and in chains; that he has preserved his nationality almost 'intact;' that his enemies have, at most, had but an empty triumph over him, and that the end of their greatest exertions has been, in the words of the Roman poet,

> *Intactus* . . . Britannus ut descenderet
> Sacra catenatus Via.

CHAPTER VI.

THE UTILITY OF ETHNOLOGICAL INVESTIGATIONS.

Popular objections—Ethnology the only science which can unfold the correlations of mind with body, or of the mental faculties with one another—Emotional differences not dependent on different forms of skull—Intellectual differences probably have some connexion with different forms of skull—Correlations of mental faculties one with another—The knowledge of these correlations is necessary for a good system of education—Variety a necessary element in education—The Englishman possesses great advantages in the varied aspects of his country—Ethnology essential to History—Reasons for entitling this work 'A Prologue to Authentic English History.'

In this extremely practical age there are always many persons ready to brand as useless any study which does not bring an immediate return in hard cash. What does it matter, they will say, whether we are descended from Britons or Saxons, or both, or neither, whether our ancestors came from the north or from the south, whether they had heads of one shape or heads of another shape, whether they were wise or foolish, merry or dull, inventors or plodders? Why should we compare together languages which have no value in the commercial world, dig up skulls which will not sell, measure heads when we are not hatters, investigate mental phenomena when we are

not mad-doctors? This study will never bring more money into our pockets, greater speed to our railways, better light to our streets, or in any way greater happiness to ourselves or to our fellow-men. Why then should we trouble ourselves about it?

There are two ways of answering these questions. In the first place, there is a certain pleasure in the mere exercise of the intellect, whether that intellect be great or little; and some of those who make ethnology their mental gymnasium may perhaps be unable to find equal pleasure elsewhere. That answer, of course, holds good only so far as the ethnologists themselves are concerned. Ethnology, it may be said, is of some value to the ethnologist himself, but not to mankind in general, just as chopped hay is of great practical use to a horse, but not to a human being.

But there is a second and more complete way of answering the *cui bono?* objection. It is not only to the ethnologist that ethnology is likely to be useful. Ethnology is, or ought to be, the study of human attributes on a grand scale, the study of the differences and the resemblances existing between different sections of the human family. If any conclusions can be built upon the mass of facts with which ethnology has to deal, they must have a basis infinitely more solid than that of conclusions built merely upon a few isolated instances. It may possibly be necessary to verify by single instances

the results which are suggested by the general evidence, but it is to such general evidence that we can most confidently look for the first suggestions themselves. Without ethnology, it is impossible that the study of human nature, that Anthropology, can ever take rank as a science; that we can know what are the correlations of man's physical with his psychical peculiarities, or of his psychical or physical peculiarities one with another. No one will deny that such knowledge is desirable; that without such knowledge our whole system of education is a mere succession of random shots.

It is true that even with the assistance of ethnology we may fail in attaining these desired ends; they may be unattainable. But ethnology certainly forms a very considerable portion of the road which must be traversed if the goal is to be reached. It must, too, be admitted that we may possibly be bound on an endless journey; that our goal may be a fiction of our own imaginations; that the correlations for which we are searching may have no existence in nature. Be it so; still ethnology will render us inestimable service by proving to our satisfaction that we are striving for an impossibility. If we cannot find what we want in the direction of ethnology, we may be sure that we cannot find it at all. We may then, if we please, abandon the search, and devote ourselves to pursuits which give better promise of useful results. But until we have thoroughly satisfied ourselves that the correlations for which we are looking

have no existence or no fixed laws, we are bound to regard ethnology as one of the most important branches of human enquiry.

But, it may be asked, what laws have already been established in ethnology? What single law of any practical utility have ethnologists ever brought to light? What have they done but collect a mass of more or less interesting facts, and in some cases fictions? Not much more perhaps; and yet a little more. They have set up many theories which cannot all be true. But so did astronomers before the time of Copernicus; so did the alchemists; so have geologists done; so have historians done from the time of Herodotus downwards. Had ethnology already performed her task, had she a complete system of laws thoroughly established, she would certainly need no defender.

What, then, is the nature of the laws which ethnology may one day serve to establish, if she is ever to be the means of establishing any laws at all? What can we hope to gain by such investigations as are found in this volume?

I do not pretend that I have brought together evidence which establishes any definite law with certainty. But it seems to me that there are some conclusions in favour of which there is a very strong probability.

In the first place, I think we are justified in inferring that differences of emotional manifestations—of temperament—do not depend entirely, or even

principally, upon different relative length or breadth of skull or brain. The proverbially irascible and generally emotional Frenchman has a skull intermediate in shape between that of the proverbially phlegmatic German and that of the Englishman, who is neither excessively phlegmatic nor excessively irascible. If irascibility were connected with great relative breadth of skull, the Germans should be more irascible than the French; if length, rather than breadth, were the source of irascibility, then hardly any European people should be more irascible than the English. The long-headed Highlander is as prone to anger as the somewhat short-headed Frenchman; no one is more prone to anger than a short-headed North Welshman, no one less prone to anger than a short-headed North German.

Nor do I see reason to believe that emotional manifestations are in any way connected with relative height of brain or skull. I have, it is true, no confidence in the assertions of one school of anatomists, that the Germans have generally flat and low brain-cases, or of another school, that they have generally high and arched brain-cases. I have no confidence in general statements, based upon the observation of very few instances; and as the hatters cannot give me much information, I am compelled to disregard differences of height, except in those cases which have come under my own observation. But it seems to me that the greater proneness to emotions of all kinds exhibited by women of all countries, when

compared with men, is enough to show that the typical form of head in any nation does not suffice to explain the national temperament. Some anatomists, it is true, declare that the female skull does not generally conform to the national type. But these divergences, if they occur, must balance one another. If the female skull is, among a low-headed people, apt to be high, and, among a high-headed people, to be low, the fact that almost all women are of a highly emotional temperament is absolutely incompatible with the theory that the emotions vary with the height of the skull.

I am not, however, arguing that the contents of the skull have no connexion at all with emotional manifestations. It is quite possible and even probable that those manifestations cannot appear without a certain cerebral organisation. I may, perhaps, best illustrate my meaning by a parallel case. No one can play on the piano without fingers; and yet of two persons possessing to all appearance equally well-formed and supple fingers, one may be able to play exquisitely, the other not at all. The bones and muscles of the fingers are necessary, but do not make the player. In like manner, certain portions of brain may be indispensable to the play of every emotion, and yet may be possessed equally by those who are easily moved, and by those who are seldom moved at all.

It is quite possible that all emotional differences may be produced by differences in the arterial

system,* or differences in the chemical constitution, distribution, or size, of individual brain-tissues or nerve-tissues, even though the total bulk of those tissues may be the same. It is obvious that, if in two skulls of the same length, breadth, and height, the individual brain-tissues differ in size, the brains must differ in their whole constitution. In one skull one set of tissues may be enormously developed at the expense of another, while in the other skull the conditions may be totally reversed. In one skull the individual tissues may be comparatively coarse and few, in the other many and delicate; and yet these differences may have no external sign—may be discoverable only by the aid of a powerful microscope, if discoverable at all.

But how, it will be said, does ethnology help us here? She helps us considerably by reducing the number of experiments and observations which it is necessary for us to make. If we know that it is useless to compare the proportions of the skull, and even the general outlines of the brain, in the search for the causes of different emotional manifestations, we have at least simplified the problem. We are like travellers who have arrived at a point where many roads meet. Suppose that there are five roads, and that we have ascertained one of them to lead in the wrong direction, the number of chances against

* The well-known effects of almost every emotion, and especially of fear, upon the heart, give great probability to this hypothesis.

us has become less than it was when we were in equal ignorance about all the roads. The chances were at first four to one against us; they are now only three to one. We have destroyed one out of four enemies.

There is, however, no reason to infer that intellectual manifestations are unconnected with the form of the skull. On the contrary, there is some reason to suspect that the broad and short head is connected with the tendency to collect and compile rather than to classify or invent, and the longer and narrower head with the tendency to invent and classify rather than merely to collect or compile. If we take the three principal peoples whose skull-forms and intellectual capacities we have been attempting to ascertain, we find that the shortest skull-form, the German, is associated with the greatest power of elaborating details, and the least power of originating; that the longest skull-form, the English, is associated with the greatest inventive and classifying power; while the intermediate skull-form, the French, is associated, so far as classifying power is concerned, with an intermediate intellectual constitution. But the difficulty of ascertaining the average height of the skull among these three peoples throws doubt on any conclusion which we might be disposed to draw from the known facts.

If my own limited observations may be trusted, the English skull is, on the average, higher than either the German or the French skull; and, if so, either

the power of detecting hidden resemblances or the constructive power possessed by the English may be connected with the height of their skulls. It is perhaps unsafe to trust casts and portraits, which are frequently either unauthentic or 'idealised,' according to the taste of the artist; but I know of no instance in which a great inventor is represented with a low head; in many cases the forehead forms half, or even more than half, of the whole face; in others, though the forehead may be low, there is great height above and behind the ears. If it could be shown that height of skull is connected with constructive power, we should then have some reason to suspect not only that breadth of skull is connected with memory and the love of detail but also that length of skull is connected with the power of classifying and perceiving resemblances.

These are but crude hypotheses which have suggested themselves to me in the course of my investigations, and which a wider experience may either confirm or show to be untenable. It is probable, too, that, even should a certain relative length, breadth, or height, of skull be found to accompany certain intellectual capacities, the energy with which those capacities are brought into action may depend upon quite different causes, upon causes perhaps analogous to those which influence the emotions; perhaps upon the size of the nerve-fibres or the action of the heart; perhaps upon some cause hitherto unsuspected.

But difficult though it certainly must be to ascertain the correlations of physical with psychical phenomena, it may perhaps be somewhat easier to establish what is of quite equal importance, the correlations of psychical manifestations one with another. Even though we may never know with certainty that any physical constitution invariably accompanies any mental constitution, we may know that one mental phenomenon invariably accompanies another. We may make discoveries analogous to those of the comparative anatomist, who, when he sees an animal chewing the cud, knows at once that it has a cloven hoof, who, when he 'sees merely the print of a cleft foot, may conclude that the animal which left the impression ruminated. And this conclusion is as certain as any other in physics or morals. This footprint alone, then, yields to him who observes it the form of the teeth, the form of the jaws, the form of the vertebræ, the form of all the bones of the legs, of the thighs, of the shoulders, and of the pelvis of the animal which has passed by.'*

I think my investigations point towards similar mental correlations. We are not here met by contradictions as we are when we attempt to ascertain the correlations of the body with the mind. We may only suspect that the wondering German wonders simply because his heart or arteries differ from those of the Englishman; but we may feel more confident

* Cuvier, ap. Huxley, *The Elements of Comparative Anatomy*, p. 5.

that the man who is given over much to wonder is not a wit, and conversely that the wit is not much given to placid wonder. There is also good reason to infer that, where there is little humour, there is little constructive power and little power of detecting resemblances. The Englishman is witty and inventive; the Frenchman is witty and inventive; but the German,* as a rule, is neither. The inference may perhaps be in part an analysis of the sense of the ludicrous, but it is also something more. It is an inference that in any community in which there are many wits there will be found more inventors than in a community of equal magnitude in which there are few wits. The inventive power may, in one individual, take one form, and in another another. When it is abundant among any people, both forms of it will certainly make their appearance. But where wit is absent, learning is often present. The man who lacks inventive power is frequently in a certain sense more learned than the dramatist or the discoverer. He is to the discoverer as a snowball to a bee; set him rolling, and he will pick up every particle that comes in his way, and become perhaps at last a mass of somewhat unwieldy erudition; send the discoverer or the dramatist abroad, and he will extract all the sweetness from a thousand flowers, and store it up where it is available for the use of the whole human hive.

* There are, of course, Germans, and Englishmen, and Frenchmen, who are exceptions to the general rule.

We find ourselves here led to another question: is there any correlation between the two great branches into which at last the intellect divides itself, between the power of retaining and the power of classifying, grouping, colligating, or constructing? Does more of one power imply more or less of the other? To this question I do not think an answer can be confidently given at present; but as few, if any, great discoveries have been made without considerable previous training, we may fairly suppose that great powers of construction are generally accompanied by at least considerable powers of retention; and as works involving very great powers of retention frequently appear without any sign of corresponding constructive or classifying powers, we may fairly suppose that a great share of the former is not necessarily accompanied by any considerable share of the latter.

Ethnology, then, has given us some suggestions of mental correlations; we have found that the Englishman has both humour and invention, but very little disposition to wonder; and that the Frenchman also has both humour and invention, but very little disposition to wonder. We have found that the German has a tendency to wonder rather than to act, to compile rather than to classify or invent, and that he is deficient in humour. We do not find any contradiction to these suggestions. We do not find a nation which has great humour with a tendency to wonder, and to compile rather than to classify or con-

struct. We do not find a nation which is greatly given to classification and construction, and which is deficient in humour. We do not find any of the suspected correlations contradicted by any well-known facts; and they have therefore a strong probability in their favour, a probability which would, I think, become even stronger if the theory were applied to individuals. Goethe, for instance, who differed from the ordinary German type of intellect in having the power of perceiving resemblances very strongly developed, differed from it also in having a considerable share of humour, which occasionally makes its appearance in 'Faust.'

That these correlations may be confirmed, and that other and more important correlations may be discovered, may, I think, reasonably be hoped. And, if so, the utility of ethnology will be indisputable. The parent may then know, from a single indication, the capacities of his child, as the comparative anatomist knows the outline of the body from a single tooth.

Nor do I think that even now the parent is without some indications of the true system of intellectual education. He may ask the simple questions, does my child show more originality or plodding industry? does he show a greater aptitude for mere acquisition or for assimilation? can he create or only appropriate, or can he do either well? These questions can probably only be answered by giving the child fair opportunities. If he has the power of storing up

other men's discoveries, he may have a greater aptitude for one kind of acquisition than for another. If he has the power of detecting hidden resemblances, of classifying, of combining, he must have the materials given him to combine, to classify, in which to detect the resemblances. The very wit and humour which may give the first indications of his intellectual character are impossible without the materials for incongruous associations. If the child has great industry, there may be some trace of emotion which may make his industry profitable under some circumstances and not under others, just as a trace of some chemical element gives power and flavour to a compound otherwise insipid. So, too, some unsuspected superiority in some particular sense may give a bias to a character, but the superiority can be clearly manifested only under favourable circumstances.

The history of nations and individuals shows that variety of experience is conducive to success. The man who would carefully master the details of anatomy might not choose to master the details of law. The man who does not know that there are such things as vertebræ can never discover that there is a resemblance between vertebræ and the bones of the skull. If a child has only the power of redintegration strongly developed with a special liking or aptitude for some particular subject, the greater the variety of subjects to which he is introduced the more likely he is to discover that for which he is

best fitted. If he has strong power of detecting resemblances or of combination, it is by attention to a great variety of subjects that these powers can be best brought into play. The discoverer is seldom, if ever, a man of one idea, the dramatist probably never. Goethe and Watt were ever ready to plunge into a new pursuit; to search for new resemblances, for new combinations. Shakspeare seems to have sympathies with the whole world, and attains the highest dramatic success; Byron can never lose sight of himself, and fails as a dramatist, even though he succeeds as a poet.

Ethnology tells just the same tale. The Englishman's splendid successes, though impossible without his characteristic cast of mind, might never have been attained had he not lived in a medium of many aspects. Not only has he ingenuity, not only has he a mind which can perceive unsuspected resemblances, but he has also before his eyes a profuse variety of objects upon which his ingenuity may be exercised, in which new resemblances may be traced. There is perhaps no area of equal size which in climate and in geological formation presents so many varieties as England. She is a little world in herself. She has all the advantages of sea and land. There are times when her rivers are ice-bound like those of Northern Russia; there are times when the rich blue sky of Italy looks down upon English meadows as green as the meadows of Ireland. In England the cattle may browse on green pastures parted only by a hedge from ripe and yellow wheat. Not far off the country

grows black with coal-fires; all kinds of mineral wealth are wrung from the bowels of the earth. In a journey of an hour or two, the whole of the poet's fabled ages may be seen here in England; from the age of gold to the age of iron; from pastoral simplicity to Birmingham craft.

The Englishman, whatever may be his natural endowments, need not travel far to find a whetstone for his wits. The poet, the dramatist, the artist of every kind, can see every phase of life, the mechanic every incitement to make new inventions for land or for water, the lover of facts as many facts as he can desire.

But let it never be forgotten that all the materials, indispensable though they undoubtedly are, are nothing without the mind which knows how to use them. It is a fatal error both in ethnology and in history to neglect one side of the question; as fatal to forget the character dealing with the circumstances as to forget the circumstances acting upon the character. If we could find a time at which the characters of all men were alike, or even more alike than they are now, and if we could then trace their divergence under different circumstances, we might entertain Buckle's nobly false theories, in that case perhaps no longer false, and trace every present fact to known facts of the past. But it unfortunately happens that both individuals and nations have differed widely at all periods with which we have any acquaintance. There can be no doubt that circumstances modify the characteristics

both of nations and of individuals; and it is by no means improbable that all modifications may have been, in the first instance, the result of circumstances. But no one can, as yet, tell us what circumstances first made one people generally phlegmatic and another generally energetic or passionate. No one can, as yet, tell us what circumstances made the inhabitants of France differ so widely as they do from the inhabitants of Prussia. Until we can trace these differences to their starting-point; until we can be certain that, however they may have been perpetuated, they did not arise, as other variations arise, without assignable cause, we must accept ethnic differences as elements to be dealt with in all histories which claim to be of any practical value. Nay more; as these differences have existed in all historical time, they can never be safely disregarded, however much the method of treating them may be modified by future discoveries.

History is valuable only for the lessons which it teaches. The history which merely records facts and dates, which tells us that one king killed another in battle, and was himself killed by a conspirator, that a populace gained certain privileges, and a monarch or an oligarchy lost them, is simply a narrative more or less pleasant to read unless it shows why the privileges were gained, and why the lives were lost. And those questions can never be solved so long as one important condition of the problem remains unheeded.

Is it not obvious that, if constructive power is abundant in one nation, and not in another, there must exist, with it, a greater power of combining to attain a given object, and a greater probability of political skill in the governing body? Is it not obvious that excessive irascibility in any nation will prevent the harmonious action of a number of men for a length of time, even though they may possess great constructive power? Is it not obvious that the nation which sits down in tranquil wonder at every remarkable event is less likely to make a conspicuous figure in the world's history than the nation which is ever ready for action, and leaves the wonder for its women and its children?

In the case of individuals no one would hesitate to answer 'yes' to all these questions. Why not then also in the case of nations? Why not more readily in the case of nations than of individuals? Has not the individual the power of concealing his true character, while the general characteristics of a nation hardly admit of mistake? The principal features of a nation's mind are traceable in its literature, its art, its science, in all its national works; and though it is true that all these works are the works of individuals, it is impossible that those individuals could have been in league to deceive us. And no historian can afford to neglect these national features; in them may be read many secrets of the past; in them, too, may possibly be seen dimly some few secrets of the future.

It is now perhaps apparent why I have called my work 'A Prologue to Authentic English History.' But let it not, therefore, be supposed that I look upon it as *the* prologue, as the only possible prologue. In the highest sense of the term—as the science which deals with the physical and mental characteristics of different peoples—ethnology is, I think, an essential part of history. It is an equally essential part of that still more comprehensive study—if we may not yet call it science—the study of man. But the field is, of course, open to every historian, to every student, to form his own ethnological conclusions. For my own part, I shall be content if others are found to do better what I have here attempted to do; if others will acknowledge that some systematic investigation of our character and our origin is a thing to be desired. I hope the exposure of those mistakes, which are inevitable in such a work as this, may help and give light to others on their way. The road which I have passed over is somewhat rugged in places, but it has been a very pleasant road to me, and I have done what little I could to make it smoother and pleasanter for my readers and my successors.

LONDON
PRINTED BY SPOTTISWOODE AND CO.
NEW-STREET SQUARE

00031951

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 02 July, 2018